

David and Raminder

Recorded across 2 meetings. 24-26 Nov 2021

David coded as "D," Raminder coded as "R."

R: Are you happy with your real name being used? Can you tell me why? There's a split down the middle, of those who are, and those who aren't. And I'd like to know why that is in your case.

D: It feels like it is important to speak out against what's happening, and not just to do so anonymously. At this point simply the act of speaking out 'publicly' seems to me to be important, because what we're dealing with seems to me like the most monstrous kind of orthodoxy, or at least a potentially monstrous one. Somehow, practically overnight in March 2020, it was tabooed – it became a taboo – to not sign up to a very particular interpretation of reality: an interpretation that, to me, and many millions of others, has never made very much sense. And that has been perhaps the root of my suspicion right from the beginning: when you're not allowed to question something that is so patently questionable, that immediately raises my hackles. Most of the rules in this culture are ones that most of us can broadly agree on. So it should immediately raise our suspicions when it's effectively compulsory to believe a particular interpretation of the world, a particular interpretation of reality, that to me feels completely at odds with what is most important in life. I expect I'll come back to this point again and again, but yeah, for me, it's important to stand up for what you believe and to speak out, publicly.

If you don't agree with what's going on, it seems important to have the integrity to stand up and say so. That doesn't mean that I am any less prone to being wrong about things. I'm as fallible an individual as everyone. So, you know, I'm putting my name to a belief, or set of beliefs, not stating that I *know* anything. I'm looking at the facts and figures that are out there, but primarily acting on experience and intuition, and coming to a very different conclusion to that which the collective cultural mainstream wants me to come to. But I reserve the right to be wrong! In the future I may look back at the beliefs I expressed over the last couple of years and admit that I did not get everything right! The fact is I don't know anything. But if nobody questions the ideologies that are pressed onto us by those in power, then we are really in trouble. So, yes, stand up for what you believe in, stand up for what you believe is right, and speak out when you believe something is wrong.

I believe that what's happening is profoundly wrong. So I wouldn't be able to live with myself if I didn't try to be honest about my thoughts, beliefs and intuitions about it. I'm baffled by how many people seem to feel okay about just being silenced: this sense that you are not allowed to question any of it. It's extraordinary. I think that there are many, many people – people who have gone along with it all so far – who feel extremely uneasy about what is happening

R: Yeah. When I first started getting pieces accepted by alternative press, For some reason, I've been around a little bit now. I don't understand how or why this happened , but it's happened. I did have to make the decision: "do I want to put my real name to these things?" And I chose to do so. And I remember, it was late at night, you know, [I was] drafting an email to the editor of the Conservative Woman, who actually don't want to be called "Conservative" anymore, because of what's happened. OK. And I was thinking: "Should I send this under an alias?" And it was just like: "no. no, no, no, no, no. This is me baring my chest."

And I can understand the trepidation that some people feel, but I also want to understand their motivations when they do want to publicise themselves, because in many cases, they incur risk of real disadvantage. Yeah?

D: Well, I do as well. I incur that risk by speaking out, and doing so has already led to a range of negative consequences for me, certainly in terms of personal relationships, and almost certainly in my work life too.

From almost the very beginning I've spoken out publicly about my total opposition to every part of this orthodoxy. For better or for worse, that's what I've done, that's what I'm doing, and I will have to accept the consequences.

R: So one of the things about semi structured interviewing, is that what you just said, segues into things, which may not necessarily be in the order that I would have got. So I think it's a good time to ask about masking now for that reason. And this is one of the most acrimonious subjects of this entire new normal orthodoxy. It seems as though, as we've discussed Agamben before, "the politics of the face" is something, which is something of a battlefield, right?

So can you tell me you understand, or what your thoughts on the mask are? Why the revulsion, why the feelings towards it , as you've just expressed?

D: Well, it seems to me that face coverings are primarily a tool of control and compliance, and that is effectively what wearing them achieves. I don't think that wearing a face covering has any health benefits. I think that if anything, it's likely to be detrimental to health. To me it seems so completely obvious that it is not necessary for human beings to go around with their faces covered in everyday life. It just doesn't make any sense that, overnight, the nature of reality and illness would completely change, and a practice that was previously non-existent in public space in this country would suddenly be necessary. The whole mythology of "the pandemic" would hold that the nature of reality and illness *did* effectively completely change overnight, but that is all it is: a mythology, propagated by the dominators, and it's not a mythology that informs my decisions about how to act in the world, and what to wear or not wear on my face.

Ultimately, what this practice is is *unnatural*. And many, many people have shown conclusively that simple face coverings are not going to have any effect on the transmission of microscopic microorganisms. It's just not going to make any difference, even if you accept all the other premises about "the virus" and "the pandemic" and so on.

So the effect of these mandates is quite clearly to consolidate a particular kind of control structure and to consolidate the adherence to this wider orthodoxy. It's about saying, "this is the way things are, and you're not allowed to question this". And then wearing a face covering becomes a visual sign that you go along with this particular interpretation of the world.

It's a kind of cultic practice, and by going along with it, you help to normalise that practice. In that sense it's an extremely insidious mode of tyranny, because simply by going along with it, you help to normalise it, you help to consolidate it. That, to me, is the heart of the issue. And that's why I've never ever done it, and why I never will, because to me, it's at the heart of what is happening.

It's a very *visible* practice, of course, and it's also about the negation of individuality. The face is the main locus of everyone's *individuality*, so if you cover everyone's faces, then there are no individuals anymore, there's just a group. There's just a group that all believe and support, or appear to believe and support, the same ideology. So the face coverings are a very powerful tool for the dominators in that respect.

And the fact that it was tabooed right from the beginning to speak out about it, and to not go along with it, has just been absolutely central to my belief that what is happening is not right.

R: I mean, it's important to define what is happening as well. Because everybody's got their own interpretation of what is going on. And so what I like to do is ask people to define certain terms that have been quite contentious overall. So could you please define for me COVID is, what a "lockdown" is, and what the "new normal" is?

D: My answer is that I don't know what COVID is. Quite obviously, illness and death are the most undeniable and the most universal things in the world. But as far as I can see, there hasn't really been any particularly unusual mortality since this all started. There was some excess mortality in 2020 but, as researchers like Simon Elmer have shown, those excess deaths may well have been wholly a result of the unnecessary shutdown of normal health services.

But what is most important about "COVID" it is that it's a new word: the central term in this new lexicon. Most people that are signed up to the orthodoxy think they do know what it is, and they think that what it is is quite straightforward: that it's a virus that you either have or don't have, and that there are tests that reliably tell whether you "have" this thing, or you don't "have" this thing.

"What is COVID?" is an interesting question, The first thing it is, for me, is a hysteria, a mass phenomenon, a groupthink. Perhaps the second thing that it is is a tyranny. And then perhaps the third thing it is, is an illness.

What's a "lockdown"? Again, I try not to use the language of the dominators, of the oppressors, so I would call them "shutdowns", or something. Mostly it's a word that just really irritates me. It's another essential part of the newnormalist lexicon and represents the normalisation of a practice that was previously unheard of, of staying at home. The people that go along with it, they often seem to rather relish talking about it, because this new thing is kind of exciting to them. They don't question this term, or any of the others, at all, and instead they seem to have welcomed it into their vocabulary, as an exciting new idea that also provides some common ground with all the other people who parrot this term.

I find the casualness with which people talk about this draconian, tyrannical edict astonishing and depressing. This edict that comes down from outside and says, "you must close your business," or "you must stay at home." The precedent that has now been set by this tyrannical practice should be incredibly concerning to everyone.

Suddenly you can now just be told to shut things down and shut your life down whenever the government decides that's appropriate. So, yeah, the casualness and the way that people actually *enjoy* talking about it, and the way it's sort of considered to be benign, I think is extremely concerning.

R: I understand what you're saying, I do have to use the language of the oppressors because these are universal terms, and they are concepts that although they are new and odious, horrible, and the rest of it—

D: They're very important to an understanding of what's going on.

R: Yes. And to your point about locking down, Neil Ferguson in an interview put out in The Times on Christmas Day said: "lockdowns: we will not hesitate to use them again." The tyrannical edicts are here to stay because the Rubicon has been crossed. And there we have it. That's all there is to it.

So we were also talking about new normalism and "New Normal". So, could you give us a few words on what that is to you?

D: I think it's a very good way to describe everything that's happened since March 2020. Not "the new normal," but newnormalism, which is an ideology. The "new normal" sounds like it describes a state of affairs. If people are uncritically describing reality as something called "the new normal", they are ultimately suggesting that the basic nature of reality changed overnight in March 2020. I don't believe it did.

R: The sun still came up. The birds still sang.

D: But I should clarify as well, I'm not a supporter of the old normal either! I'm not one of these people that thinks that everything was fine back in February 2020. I already had profound and longstanding concerns about the culture that we live in. Everything that has happened since then is actually just a huge ramping up of previously existing trends in this culture, in the culture of the “developed” industrial world.

R: I have felt many times that it's all of our neuroses writ large. Safetyism, risk aversion; when we get together, the idea of togetherness is the idea of comparing notes on our patterns of consumption, nothing more. That's all we have. Behold thy god, his name is Netflix.

D: Newnormalism is an ideology. It's sort of a religion. It's certainly a quasi-religious movement, whose basic tenet is this narrative about a microorganism, and the necessity to receive a quasi-sacred pharmaceutical substance, wear a mask, and practice “distancing”. Its foundational myth is that the basic nature of the world changed in March 2020, but actually, it's an unspoken foundational myth, you know, because to actually acknowledge that would mean encountering the absurdity of that idea. Because the basic nature of reality didn't change in March 2020.

R: Yet what has happened is that there has been a deluge of messaging which has for better or for worse convinced a huge number of people people that it has. So, can you tell me more about your thoughts on the messaging surrounding this situation?

D: The propaganda, the language, is absolutely central to what's happening. It's key to understanding what's going on, and of questioning what's going on. The term “social distancing” simply did not exist before 2020 and neither did the practice. If social distancing had existed before 2020, then it would have had a name. Instead, this practice just appeared out of nowhere in late 2019, early 2020. No one had ever heard of it before.

R: As I understand it, practices of reducing capacity in certain buildings during pandemic times had been used but that hadn't been termed in that way. There's a book by chap called Briggs who actually talks about where the while social distancing idea came in.

D: Like I say, the term “social distancing” literally entered the dictionary, The Oxford English Dictionary, in 2020. It wasn't in any other dictionaries either. Where did it come from and why? The notion, the existence, of communicable disease is as old as man, so why has it never been necessary to “social distance” before?

R :Well, I've got my own theories behind that, but it seems as though China did it. It worked, therefore Neil Ferguson, like a reverse Marco Polo bought this wonderful innovation from the East.

D: But no, I mean, it's worldwide though isn't it? To me, Neil Ferguson is just some useful idiot in this country, but the concept is an international one.

R: Yeah, I'll send you an origin theory behind it sometime later, you might find it interesting. It revolves around a 14 year old girl's science project by some account. So there we go.

Perhaps this is a very easy question or a very difficult one. Why then your opposition to all of these things? So you made it clear that you oppose, which is why we're speaking, but why?

D: Because I believe it's profoundly wrong, all of it. This groupthink, this mass phenomenon, is a very dangerous thing. It's precisely what lies behind Nazism and of course the parallels between Nazism and what's happening are legion.

R: Systematic othering.

D: Yeah. I don't know what's going to happen next and nobody does. But it's this slippery slope or this "yes ladder" that everyone who's been going along with it has been ascending or descending, whether you want to use the slippery slope analogy or the "yes ladder" analogy.

At some point you have to draw a line, but it seems to me that the question of drawing a line doesn't appear to enter the consciousness of everyone who goes along with this orthodoxy. So, why do I oppose it? I don't think that any of these practices have any effect whatsoever on people getting ill and dying. I don't think that they have any effect on life and death. If anything, it seems to me that they will have a detrimental effect on health, getting everyone to stay at home, using pharmaceutical medication to fight illness instead of your own body's own natural immunity and natural medicine, wearing face coverings. It is all likely to be detrimental to health and wellbeing, which are of course very much linked.

And, you know, it's my belief that we're *meant* to share microorganisms with one another and that's how the human body develops its natural immunity, and perhaps develops in other ways too. I don't think that we're supposed to be isolated from each other. I think the more that we connect with each other, the healthier we are in mind and body, which are not separate anyway. So I disagree with everything that's happened because it is creating and consolidating a culture based upon alienation, based upon the distancing from what is natural and what is human, and the embrace of what is synthetic and non-human. It's the rejection of the real and the natural, and the embrace of the virtual and the machinic and the artificial.

I disagree with this orthodoxy because it's based upon the idea that truth and what is real is something that is dictated to you from outside, instead of something that you discover and decide for yourself through your own direct experience of the world and through your perception, and through your intuition. But much worse than that is this demand, this absolute insistence, that you have to sign up to this version of reality, this interpretation of the world, which is transmitted to you from outside. And then, as I've already said, by going along with it, by signing up to it, you then help to perpetuate and normalise it. And it doesn't take very long, as we've seen, if you perpetuate and normalise an idea, for that idea to become the status quo. It becomes the new normal. And this is what newnormalism is at its heart. It's about establishing a completely different and deeply alienating understanding of what it means to be a human being, and what it means to be a part of human society.

The metaphor of the virus is very, very apt. Because, what the virus is, is precisely this orthodoxy, this hysteria, whatever you want to call it, this cultic practice, this set of practices and beliefs that you have to sign up to. And if you don't, then you're ostracised. You're out. You're othered. You're an outcast. You're a pariah.

So, yeah, what we've seen in the last twenty months has been a madness, and it may be heading in a direction beyond anything that even Orwell and Huxley predicted.

R: As Orwell said: "The party told you to ignore the evidence of your eyes and ears. It was their final, most essential command."

D: This is it. Ignore your experience. And just believe what you're told. Believe what you're told, and do what you're told. Don't ask questions.

R: There's a lot to unpick with what you've said there, and there's a lot of questions that will segue away from that. So I suppose for me, a good place to start, is you refer to humans as being creatures of experience, and you've kind of alluded your value system as being quite experiential. That which is seen, heard, sensed, is of importance.

So first off, can you tell me anything about a spiritual perspective you have, if any?

D: Well, ultimately, nature is my religion. But what do we mean by "nature"? That in itself is a sort of unanswerable question. I'm also a sceptic. I don't know anything and nobody knows anything. I'm interested in lots of different kinds of mythologies. I'm interested in Eastern mysticism, I'm interested in astrology, I'm interested to some extent in Christian mythology.

But I don't subscribe to any one particular mythology. I'm interested in lots, and nobody will ever know anything. All you can do is go on. "What is real is experience. What is real is this moment", said Terence McKenna. And that's all that one can say really. Nature is my religion, but I don't just mean,

you know, trees and birds and bees, although they're beautiful and wonderful. But just everything: this manifestation, this extraordinary world. But I think that's probably all I can say really. That's all that I can say at the moment.

R: My next question was gonna be “within that formulation...” but of course using the word “formulation” is kind of inappropriate, given what you’ve just said. But within your perspective then, what is the role of sickness and death? Because we talk about the inevitability of such things, and of course, nature is self renewing, and part of that self renewal is destruction; the dance of Shiva is one of destruction and renewal therein.

But you’ve also talked about the microbial world and its relation to our human world. So, I’m kind of keen to hear how that all fits in, where does falling ill and where does dying...what’s that all about (both laugh)?

D: I have no idea. But the thing is, that our culture thinks it does have an idea. It thinks death is terrible and to be avoided at all costs. Life must be extended for as long as possible regardless of what suffering the person is going through, because death is the worst thing. I mean, the idea that death is terrible is really so central to our culture. When I say “our culture”, I mean the culture of industrial “civilisation”, the culture of most of the world.

As for illness, well, nobody wants to suffer, but suffering is an absolutely unavoidable part of life. A terror of death and of suffering seems to me to be absolutely central to what is happening. And a terror of death speaks of a profound alienation from nature. Because what nature is, perhaps, is a kind of an awareness that all things that live must die, that existence is cyclical.

And we have no idea what happens when you die. Nobody does. We might have inklings, ideas and intuitions, but nobody knows. I mean death could be the most wonderful, beautiful experience that we'll ever know. We simply don't know. So death is this great taboo isn't it? It's supposedly the worst thing that can possibly happen.

R: This is quite interesting because one of the emerging trends, and I think we’ve all sensed it to some degree, everybody who’s been on this side doesn’t hold death as the worst thing that can happen. So there you have it.

D: What is much more important than not dying, is living. And, what's the Thoreau quote that opens *Walden*... about endeavouring “to live deep and suck out all the marrow of life”, so that when he came to die, he wouldn't discover that he had not lived.

R: OK. I suspected it might have been from Walden, but I’ve not actually read it. And what of morality then? We talk about “terrible things,” “good things” and our opposition to “things.” So have you any opinion/perspective on the origin of morality? Is there such a thing?

D: Blimey, I didn't realise we were going to be discussing that!

R: I sent you the cheat sheet (both laugh)!

D: I think it's simple. I think being a good person is about understanding that "what is real is experience, and what is real is this moment." Once you're an adult, once you're a reasonably conscious human being, you shouldn't need rules imposed from the outside to tell you what is right and wrong. It's just obvious. You know if you are doing the wrong thing. You know if you are being unkind. You know if you are being a bad person. I mean, it's just obvious.

And I don't think you need a deity in order for there to be morality. I think it's quite simple. It's actually about approaching life and yourself and other people with love and that's it. That's it. What is love? We all intuitively know what it is, I think.

R: That's an interesting take. See, I wonder if one's experience of love or whatever else is socialised into us. How blank is the blank slate? Maybe we believe all these things and the "do unto others..." that validity of "do unto others" has been drummed into us subconsciously.

I think to experiences of children in North Korean prison camps who were willing to rat out their own mothers with no problem whatsoever. Or indeed the genesis of psychopaths, who were raised in terrible terrible circumstances which did make monsters out of them. And then I kind of wonder "where exactly was the room for this intuition [you speak of], for these people?"

D: Can you run that past me again?

R: Well, is it really inborn? because in certain circumstances like terrible, terrible upbringings and—

D: Well, that doesn't stop it being inborn does it? It just means that terrible upbringings, the dreadful circumstances that people experienced corrupted what is natural in everyone, which is loving kindness.

But also, I don't know the answers to these questions! No one does. This is the mystery of being and being alive.

R: Yeah. My purpose here is not to rank order somebody's depth of answer or anything like that. It is merely to record and perhaps ask deeper, should I feel that's a thing that I should do. Your agnosticism, your "do not know" about so many things is no adverse reflection on you. It is merely a part of who you are.

D: I think that signing up to a faith makes life much easier. Because then you just can say: "This is the way things are. It's all laid out for me, what to believe, what's going to happen after you die and quite a lot about what it means to be moral or immoral, what is right and wrong." So, you know, obviously religions provide a nice "get out of the mystery" don't they?

R: They do.

D: Of the profound mystery that we're all involved in. And they allow you to basically close it down, to close down the mystery, and to say: "This is the way it is, this is what I believe." Newnormalism has come in at a time when "atheism" has been sweeping through the "developed world" for a century or more. In this absence of any religious faith, a new religion called "Science" has come in to fill the void.

R: Well I'd say "Scientism," right?

D: Scientism, yeah, exactly. Or what the Branch Covidians call "the science." They say, "follow the science." But you see, there's an interesting difference here, because science is an ongoing process which admits of the possibility of doubt and revision. But "the science," which is always quoted by the Covidian faithful, is a kind of unchanging, quasi-religious dogma, in which injections, anti-social distancing and face coverings are treated as sacred and cannot be questioned.

So that's the difference between "science" and "the science." And there's all these interesting little lexical things that have been going on that I haven't quite puzzled out yet. One thing that I mentioned before (and I wonder if I should even mention this, because it sounds a little bit bizarre, it's a bit of a strange observation), is the way that people always talk about so-called lockdowns without using the definite article. They always go "during lockdown, I did such and such", as opposed to "during *the* lockdown", and there's just something about it that irks me.

I suppose, on reflection, the reason it jars with me is because "*the* lockdown" would make it sound like a one-off phenomenon, but when people talk casually and coolly about "lockdown" it suggests they have assimilated this idea into their normality, into their "newnormal" reality. I mean, it's something that bugs me, because so much about what's happening is both reflected in the language, and consolidated *through* language. So, I don't even really like to say the word "COVID". I really don't like that word, so I don't ever say it unless I have to, and I very seldom have to, since there's other things you can say.

Another interesting and odious thing is when people refer to the last two years as "a pandemic." They say "we're in the middle of a pandemic", as if anything like this has ever happened in history before. Sure, there have supposedly been pandemics of communicable disease in the past, but nothing anywhere close to this scale of hysteria and governmental response, or the way that it has infiltrated every little bit of the culture. The notion that what is happening is in any way comparable to the Spanish flu, or any of these other supposed "pandemics", is just absurd.

The last two years represent a completely unique phenomenon. Calling it a “pandemic” may or may not be appropriate but it certainly isn’t like any other supposed pandemic.

R: We were on the origin of morality and then languages. It segued into language. It was prescribed morality coming from an external source and how Covidianism has filled the void left by religion, which I think is something many of us feel. That’s the kind of thing with any kind of totalitarian system. And if you want to get down to brass tacks too, some fundamentalist Muslims when they’ve been on record about why it is they adhere with such zeal, say it’s because “nothing is left to thought.”

D: Nothing is what?

R: Nothing is left to thought.

D: Yeah.

R: “I am told when to wake up. I am told when to get on my knees. I am told when to eat, I am told when to do this, that and the other.” And that makes life a lot easier.

D: It does, yeah, it does. We were talking about the mystery, and ultimately the mystery is terrifying. Those of us who acknowledge that everything is a great mystery, we can’t *really* face that. We have to kind of keep that awareness buried to some extent. You need to kind of ignore that awareness for much of the time, because it would be impossible to function in such a state of profound unknowingness.

R: All right, so we were talking about inversion of language you referred to the injection as something of a sacrament. So perhaps a more standard question now, what is your take on the current vaccination drive and the messaging surrounding it?

D: I’m extremely concerned about it. I just think it’s really, really worrying because it seems to me to be more about indoctrination into the wider orthodoxy, than about what I had always understood immunisation to be. I’d never questioned vaccination and immunisation in my life. I had just always, like most people, gone along with the idea that it was a sensible thing. I had vaccinations as a child and I had the necessary jabs in order to travel to India in 2008 without giving it a second thought.

Like most of my responses to what’s going on, my opposition to the programme of so-called vaccination is ultimately based on intuition: that it isn’t necessary and that receiving this injection is an effective way to consolidate your compliance with all the rest of the orthodoxy and this particular interpretation of reality, a particular understanding of this supposed virus.

Nothing that has happened since the so-called vaccinations were introduced a year ago has done anything to make me believe otherwise. Nothing has made me think that using our body's natural defences is not the best way to deal with illness. It's just so profoundly against the natural order of things that the right thing to do in this situation is to combat it with pharmaceutical so-called medication.

R: But surely the same can be said of all kinds of mass vaccination campaigns, right?

D: Maybe, but this so-called vaccination clearly doesn't prevent you from carrying and transmitting this particular microorganism. My understanding of immunisation was that it prevents those things.

R: That it's sterilising?

D: And that clearly doesn't appear to be the case. I mean, when is this hamster wheel of injections going to reach its conclusion? I mean, it seems to be just an ongoing thing, that you will just continue to receive these injections forevermore.

I mean, how does that square with an understanding of life as being something that's in tune with the natural world? I don't think we need pharmaceuticals. There may be a role for them in reducing symptoms, but I don't think that they are a *sine qua non* of a civilised culture. But again, they're being presented as being of a piece with the nature of reality suddenly changing in March 2020.

I mean, what changed in March 2020 was precisely the idea that life is about culture and not nature. This whole thing is, first and foremost, in my view, a cultural phenomenon, not a natural phenomenon. I think the newnormalist understanding is: "evil and wicked nature is out to get us, and has to be stopped with drugs and with all these other cultural practices, like wearing masks and distancing and separation."

It's a cultural phenomenon that we've witnessed. Or at least it's much more a cultural phenomenon than any kind of natural phenomenon. And I suppose it's of a piece with the idea that we are living in the Anthropocene, where life on this planet is determined by the behaviour of human beings and not the behaviour of all of the other natural processes and living things outside of human culture.

R: OK. So, we've also seen a lot about vaccine passports. And, you know, there's been a tremendous socio-political shift, to tying the idea of freedom with vaccination and topping up the things on your loyalty card. A cultural phenomenon, a redefinition of reality. So are vaccine passports then another ritual or another a sacrament in this weird religion? Do you have an opinion of them other than what I've just sort of suggested?

D: No, I don't have a different opinion. I mean, they're a membership card of the religion aren't they? That's essentially what they are, and proof that you're an adherent to the faith, so that you can therefore access services and jobs and events and all the rest of it. It's entirely a way to segregate the adherents

from the non-adherents and to encourage as many people as possible to adhere to this particular faith. They are proof that you have ingested the sacramental so-called medicine.

R: Yes. So a couple more questions on this side. We are jumping here in there, so I wouldn't— So March 2020, seems like quite a pivotal month for you, as of course for many of us, right? So what was your experience when Boris Johnson went from Prime Minister to dictator and said “you must stay at home?” What was that period in time? You know, what was your experience of it?

D: Well, it felt wrong, right from the beginning. I just felt intuitively that something was amiss and that it was important, at the very least, to be sceptical about what was happening. And it was just a huge shock that there was so little questioning of what was going on, right from the beginning. And it was just very eerie, that nobody was questioning the wisdom or validity of suddenly adopting these practices of shutting things down and being isolated from each other.

So, you know, I was willing to suspend my judgement for a couple of months, and wait and see what was going happen for a while. Although I didn't stay at home. Not that there was much opportunity to flout any rules, because everything was closed down. But it was when the mask mandate came in that alarm bells really started ringing for me, around June of that year. And that's when I felt strongly that everything that was happening was wrong and unnecessary from any kind of sensible health perspective.

R: So yeah, my next question was going to be how was your experience of, I hate using the word “measures” because “measures” as a word is a euphemism for what I regard as pretty barbaric practice. But you know what I mean. So how was living through this stuff?

D: It has been nightmarish at times, really nightmarish, witnessing this orthodoxy being “rolled out”, to use the modern parlance. And seeing so few people feeling that they can ask questions. And of course my experience has been very much defined by my refusal to go along with any of it. That's been difficult, because, you know, I'm only human. I want to be liked. I don't want to alienate people, just like everyone.

But refusing more or less since the beginning to go along with any of this stuff has obviously been very difficult at times. I've lost friends, I've lost some friends I've known for over 25 years. And that's been really hard. The situation has caused me a lot of anxiety, which has shown how much easier it is in life to just go along with the majority opinion and avoid confrontation, avoid rocking the boat. But I haven't been able to do that because I just wouldn't be able to live with myself, and wouldn't have any self-respect, if I just went along with things that I think are profoundly wrong.

But that's not easy. It still causes anxiety, and it causes lots of stress, and it has probably cost me professional opportunities, speaking out publicly about this. As I say, it has certainly cost me relationships with people, that have ended, or have been stillborn, because I won't keep quiet about it. So it has been very difficult. And then, at times, I've been surprised by the fact that it hasn't been more difficult. I've been surprised by the fact that actually, much of the last twenty months have been fine. And that actually, most of the anxiety that I've experienced has always been about fears of the future. Fears like: "what's going to happen when I turn up to this place, not wearing a face covering," or "what's going to happen when people find out about my views on this?" But in reality, in actuality it has usually all been about fear. And the reality has usually been absolutely fine. And actually, it's been possible to agree to disagree about this with family and good friends. I think part of the reason for that is because they all must have some doubts as well. They realise that nobody knows what's going on. And perhaps a small voice inside them is saying that "actually yeah, maybe something isn't right" about what's happening. Because surely, everyone must, at some point, have some doubts about what's going on, because we've never experienced anything like this before.

And to just accept that all this must be the right thing to do seems to me impossible, given that there's such a weight of evidence and argument and data that runs counter to the accepted orthodoxy. Denial is a very, very powerful psychological phenomenon, but it's never total, there's always chinks in the armour. And it's very difficult to completely sustain denial in the face of such a weight of evidence and argument and information. The evidence of one's own eyes and ears. One thing I've noticed since right at the beginning, is that nobody really takes social distancing seriously.

Either that, or they have no conception at all of how far two metres is. I mean, to have any kind of human society it's simply inconceivable that everyone stays two metres apart. So even at the height of the hysteria, people who were fully complying with face coverings and staying at home and everything... you'd still see them well within this preposterous two metre distance of each other. It's simply not possible to keep two metres apart. It's just ridiculous, absurd. It really is. So, right from the beginning, I've noticed that it simply can't be done, it's just an inconceivable practice.

And so, just that very fact has always suggested to me that deep down, lots of people either know, or suspect, that all this stuff is nonsense. And it's just simply that they're not allowed to say so. And so much of it, from the beginning, has been about merely paying lip service to this interpretation of the world, as opposed to really believing it and embodying it. And so the fear that is driving these practices isn't really a fear of becoming unwell. What the fear is really a manifestation of is the fear of being different and the fear of going against the orthodoxy.

Because I think, again, deep down, people kind of know that when it's your time, it's your time, and that really this supposed virus doesn't pose a real threat to them.

R: It's the whole preference falsification thing. So is it fair to say then that you view people less as collaborators and more as preference falsifiers in all of this? They say what needs to be said, to go along to get along more so than they are enthusiastic participants in this dance?

D: There's a spectrum isn't there. There's always a spectrum. But I think that, broadly speaking, it is clearly the case that most people go along with all this for an easy life, for a quiet life, because it's much, much easier to do so than to refuse, or to speak out, or to question it. So I don't view most people as enthusiastic collaborators. But there are some, of course, and conversely it's probably the people who, deep down, have the most serious doubts, that are some of the most enthusiastic collaborators. Because their reaction formation leads them to double down even more in the other direction.

Two of the best friends that I've lost are intelligent people who therefore need to be so in denial about all this, because otherwise they would be overwhelmed with the weight of evidence that what's happening is not right. Does that make sense?

R: Yeah, like some sort of weird atonement ritual?

D: Well, I think of it in terms of the psychoanalytic concept of "reaction formation". In order to repress and deny something with the extreme force that is needed, you have to go to the extreme in the other direction to successfully repress what needs to be repressed. See what I mean?

R: Yeah, But why why do that?

D: Because that's the nature of denial. That is, the more that you have to press down on something to repress it; that repressed energy, it has to be expressed somewhere. So, it's expressed much more powerfully in the other direction. So, some of the people that are the most enthusiastic collaborators, if you like, are those who, in normal circumstances, you know, pre-2020, were the most outspoken against other kinds of oppression and tyranny.

And this is the tragedy of it really, from the perspective of someone who would have called themselves a leftist and might do still, had it not been for the fact that "the left" now is defined by their adherence to newnormalism. All of this has very much put into question what the left is. But yeah, that concept of reaction formation is, I think, a useful one in understanding why it's actually some of the people who would have been my closest allies, pre-2020, who are some of the most vehement in their adherence and promotion of newnormalist practices and beliefs.

R: So I just wanted to dig a little bit further into denial and...I'm still struggling as to "why the need to deny?" You know, you talk about reaction formation and this is like, this almost is the mechanism of denial, right? This is how it happens. But surely if they are denying—

D: Reaction formation is a manifestation of denial. It's a sort of expression of it.

R: But why the need to deny? Is it the fear of ostracism?

D: Yes. And the fear of having to confront the fact that you don't know anything. It's much easier to be told what to believe than to try and figure it out for yourself.

R: OK. So then, you know, a few more sort of autobiographical questions, then. More interview meat and potatoes. So who are you in your own words?

D: Well, one of the people who I became alienated from earlier in the year levelled the charge at me that I was all about negation and wasn't affirming anything. That I was just saying no to masks, no to injections, no to newnormalism, but failing to affirm anything. But actually, I make it quite clear on my Twitter profile what I affirm, and that is: freedom, nature, individuality, community, peace, and love.

These are the things that I affirm. These are the things that I think make life worth living and that for me are the most important things in in life. Individuality is a really big one that this phenomenon is doing its utmost to stamp out, and it's instead promoting an idea that being "good" means adhering to groupthink.

I'm an artist, and a lecturer, and something of an activist. Freedom and nature and individuality, love and community, they're my watchwords. They're the things that define my approach to being alive and everything I do, whether that's making art, or teaching, or doing yoga, or dancing. Dancing is extremely important to me.

Those are the concepts that are important to me. Those are the things I affirm in life and that increasingly define how I live.

R: And then so in terms of sort of family situation, can you describe what relation with your family is like , do you live with anybody? Your living arrangements, that sort of thing?

D: Well, I live on my own. There's probably not much to say about family in connection with this subject. In terms of the family members who I have a relationship with, we've managed to agree to disagree about what's happening, to some extent. So, despite the fact that we disagree, so far anyway, we're still able to have a relationship, although I haven't seen them since the beginning of this phenomenon.

R: Wow. So they actually did distance themselves?

D: Last Christmas, yeah. They suggested that I see them, but that I observe "distancing", and I wasn't up for doing that. I have never complied with any of this stuff.

R: OK, and where do you get your news from? We mentioned briefly Off-Guardian. Did you experience a sort of alienation from mainstream sources before this?

D: Yeah. I used to be a real devotee of The Guardian for many years. The Guardian for me was a comrade, an ally, a friend, a source of information, a source of entertainment, a source of support. I was a real Guardianista for about fifteen years.

And then, around 2013, they really started deteriorating. And now I absolutely loathe that institution. I really despise them, because they've just lost all of their integrity. All of their integrity. And they're a completely different organisation, a completely different institution to what they once were. But many of their longstanding readers haven't realised, like boiled frogs.

So where do I get my news from? Well, the same places everyone does really. I see bits and pieces everywhere. I mean, I tend not to really read the news. Whatever simplistic narrative is being pushed by the corporate media seeps into one's awareness whether you want it to or not. I will look at the mainstream headlines, mostly on the Guardian, because I think it's important to kind of know your enemy, and to know what the mainstream narrative is, but of course, you can pretty much guess it anyway because it goes along lines that are so predictable.

R: Yes.

R: OK. Are you more comfortable in groups or on your own? Let's say there's a party going down and as a marker of social ostracism, how would it feel if you weren't invited to it?

D: Well, it would just depend on the context and on the circumstances of this party, but what's most important to me is my integrity and my self-respect. I mean, there are things that I haven't been able to do, just quite recently a dance thing, because they were insisting upon newnormalist practices. And I refuse to be a part of that. I refuse to be complicit with what's happening. So I will boycott anything that goes along with that dogma.

So, to not be invited to a party because of that dogma would just be of a piece with all of the stress and upset and misery that this whole thing has caused. As for whether I prefer to be on my own or in a group, I like both. I love people, I love company. I need human relationships, like everyone, and I love human relationships. And I also need to be on my own a lot as well. So, you know, I need both and I don't hold one over the other. And that's reflected in those five watchwords I listed before, which includes "individuality", but also "community", and they're both equally as important.

I love community, and want to be part of communities, especially if they are communities who are in tune with what I feel and believe about the world, and who value the same sort of ideas and ideals that I value. But it's also really important to maintain one's individuality in those communities. Communities of individuals is what we need, not communities of groupthinkers.

R: How do you think this is going to end? What do you imagine our future to look like?

D: I really have no idea. There are nightmarish possibilities and there's not much to suggest, really, at the moment, that those nightmarish visions of total control, and of some kind of pharmacratic culture, are not going to come to pass. I often feel very pessimistic about the future. But sometimes I'm optimistic too, because I've met lots of people during this thing who feel similarly to me.

And I think what's happening is an opportunity for both individual and collective evolution. I do think that those of us who are opposed to everything that's going on are having to kind of step up, and to speak out, and to really embrace our individuality, our sovereignty, our power. And I think that could produce new possibilities for community, for living more in harmony with nature, and for living life with sovereignty and integrity, embracing our freedom and our connection with the natural world, instead of living life being dominated by these distal power structures.

So I have no idea of what life will look like in even six months, let alone a year, let alone ten years, but lots of people I've spoken to are feeling quite positive as opposed to fearful. I think this is an opportunity for, as I say, individual and collective evolution. But, nevertheless, sometimes it can feel very bleak. And there's nothing to suggest that what is happening is going to be fully rolled back anytime soon. They sometimes take the pressure off for a while, but only so that it can be reapplied. It's a process of gradual (and then sometimes sudden) acclimatisation to practices and ideologies that only recently were unthinkable. Ultimately this programme is only going in one direction.

There's no suggestion at the moment – even though things in the UK are not anywhere near as bad as they could be compared to other places in Europe, compared to Australia, compared to a number of places – there's no suggestion that what is happening in those places won't arrive on these shores sooner or later. I think you just have to just carry on and continue to try and live based upon the integrity of your own experience and your own beliefs. And see what happens. Maybe we'll all end up in quarantine camps before long.

[We carry on in a second session]

R: So off the tape then, we talked a little bit about transhumanism, how these injections are sort of the first movements towards that and we—

D: A gateway, gateway injection (laughs)!

R: Just say no! We also talked about sterilising vaccines as being a net good. So one of the things on my sheet is: what is your take on these current injections? We talked about messaging, we talked about vaccination as practice in itself, and we also talked about your

perception on how this injection is the final indoctrination, as it were. But, what about this thing as substance? Basically, what you've just told me [off mic] a few minutes ago.

D: Well, I don't look into the science in that much depth. I leave that to other people. And I know that there are many, many people who know about this stuff, who fully reject this technology. For me, the science actually doesn't matter very much, because I just don't think that these things are necessary. So, the science behind it is neither here nor there. If you don't need something in the first place, then the question of whether it is effective doesn't make any sense.

Other people have looked into the biological technology behind these injections in detail. Obviously I know the basic outline that they supposedly generate a spike protein. But I think that the human immune system can do a perfectly good job on its own, and I think that it's actually very dangerous to rely on pharmaceutical corporations for your immunity and for your health.

Perhaps pharmaceuticals have their place as a sort of last resort, but surely it makes sense to always rely on your natural immunity, if you possibly can. Because otherwise, we seem to be encouraging a situation like we have with antibiotics, where, through overuse of antibiotics, they lose their effect.

R: Yes, you've got to take the full course of antibiotics whenever you're infected with something. Because otherwise, what happens is you apply a selection pressure but it's not enough of a pressure to completely wipe out the bugs. And that's, how MRSA came about; it's because hospitals were slinging around this antibiotic, methicillin, everywhere and lo and behold, it didn't drive the bacterial load in these environments down to zero. And so, from that, MRSA came along. And [a situation like this] is gonna happen again and again and again.

Some bacteria reproduce every 20 minutes. They double in population. That's 20 minutes and each doubling cycle has mutations. Only a matter of time. it won't take that long for—

D: Ultimately, I don't have this kind of pharmacentric view of the world. I think pharmacentricity is a bad idea. I think we should be nature-centric. Why is nobody challenging or questioning this pharmacentric approach to health? Perhaps there's a place for pharmaceuticals in the world, but to make them the absolutely central tool in having a healthy body and mind is, I think, a terrible mistake that leads us down what is ultimately a very bleak path: to not just a pharmacentric, but potentially a pharmacratic, world.

R: It's another kind of centralisation, the thing is with centralisation is it's fine up until who the power and the control is centralised with, goes bad. So, what do you think is behind all this? Is it as Simon Elmer proposed, just capital reinventing itself? Or is there a shadowy cabal of whoever?

D: The first thing to say is that I don't know. I mean, there are powerful people in the world, extremely powerful people in the world, and they have interests. They have agendas. Most exercises of power are done to serve the interests and agendas of the powerful, and those interests and agendas are often about retaining and increasing their power and their wealth, so that is one thing I do know: that the interests of the wealthy and the powerful have an extremely profound and marked influence upon the culture and on what happens. And they're usually invisible. These distal power structures are usually not particularly apparent, because they don't have any interest in having their business splashed all over the media. Consequently, Joe Public doesn't really hear about these powerful interests very much.

If the public then go looking for them and start to make noise about these powerful interests, they are, of course, labelled conspiracy theorists. Just because this information about these distal power structures isn't on the BBC, and it's not in The Guardian, and we don't hear about it every day, and it's not in everyday conversation... Just because we don't hear about it doesn't mean that it is not happening.

R: Yes, yeah, absolutely.

D: You know, the things that we do hear about now, are becoming increasingly like a soap opera. It's such a constricted framing of reality as to be absurd, really. And yet, this is what most people have been trained to believe reality is. These very constricted framings that are literally framed for them on their television, or, you know, increasingly, of course, on their phones. And it bears very little real relation to what is actually going on in the world. We all just have our very limited perspectives, and we don't really know what is happening. But a great many things are happening.

And there are people much more powerful than you and I, and they *wield* that power, they don't just sit on it. They use it to consolidate and to increase their power and wealth. But what do I think is going on? I couldn't say with any hope of precision, because it is hidden from us, intentionally.

It's important, but because we don't know, what's more important is to recognise that what's happening is wrong. To recognise that it's not right. I wouldn't dismiss anything out of hand, but all I can have any sense of knowledge about is my own experience, my own perception. My own relationship to my body, my own relationship to nature, my own relationship to spirit, and my own relationships with other individuals. And, of course, all of the huge volume of stuff that one reads and sees in the media, whether mainstream or otherwise, and in books and so on.

But, I don't know any more about what's going on than anyone else does.

R: So, we've talked about some of the dents in life that "new normalism" and "the thing" have made. How has this affected the way that you relate to others? Friends, family colleagues?

D: It's a very good question. And the answer is that I try not to let it change me. But I'm aware that sometimes I will avoid talking about it because I don't want confrontation, I don't want bad feeling generated, so it's often easier just to not mention it and not talk about it. And that's clearly something that's shared – as we were saying off mic before – by pretty much everyone, I would say.

Everyone is aware that it's potentially divisive, that it's very contentious. And no one likes fighting with people. No one likes confrontation and negativity and ill feeling, so I would say that, increasingly, we're in this bizarre situation where there's this *huge* thing going on, this bifurcation happening between people, across the whole human race, this great bifurcation, and yet, increasingly, on a kind of everyday level, it's being spoken about perhaps less and less.

Because we don't like to fall out with each other. We don't like to create tension. So it's easier to just not talk about it.

R: Don't mention the war.

D: Like I tweeted today, "don't mention the Untermenschen [both laugh]."

R: OK! I mean, that's where it's going isn't it [laughs]

D: No one liked that on Twitter, by the way. It got zero likes.

R: You were probably being hit by the algorithm. That's probably what it was.

D: That's charitable of you [laughs]. So anyway, relations. How has it affected relations with people? So, I'm just like everyone. I prefer not to talk about it, because I don't want to spend every day in endless confrontations and creating friction between myself and others. However, I won't be quiet about it. If it comes up, I won't hesitate to say that I don't comply with any of it. And sometimes it becomes important to make that known.

And sometimes when various kinds of shit is hitting the fan – like, there's been some big step towards "health" passports, "vaccine" passports, whatever – then I will make a fuss about it to people that I'm connected to, whether that's friends on Facebook, my family, or friends in the real world. So it's a balance, like everything. I don't want to get obsessed with it, because it drives me around the bend, but sometimes it's necessary to raise your voice and to point out the elephant in the room, to point out that the emperor has no clothes on and just to say: "This is happening, and I don't agree with it."

In a way I'm quite surprised that there hasn't been even more fallouts over this, even more schism and division. Because the very nature of newnormalism is that it makes it impossible to agree to disagree, because the newnormalists are saying: "Your beliefs make me unsafe."

And actually, this is really key. The fact that it *is* possible to agree to disagree, and the fact that we can get along perfectly well with each other – the injected and un.injected, the masked and unmasked, can and do rub shoulders perfectly amicably, every day – shows just how much newnormalist ideology is

nonsense. Because their ideology is based on the fact that: “You have to do these practices, these rituals, take these drugs, or you make me unsafe.” That tyranny is the absolute basis of newnormalism. But actually, the fact that pragmatically, we can see people getting along, rubbing shoulders just fine, and it doesn't matter if they've had this damn injection or not. This shows that, in reality, newnormalist ideology is absolute, absolute rot.

Everyone knows it deep down. This is the thing. The craziest thing about it is that everyone knows deep down, I believe, that it's all rubbish. It's a phenomenon of mass denial. Seriously, mass denial. Millions and millions of people are in denial. This is essentially, what I believe the reality is.

R: So I suppose to reduce it down a little bit, you don't necessarily view people who are enthusiastic about this as collaborators per se, you view them as people who are—there must be a multitude of reasons for denial and a multitude of reasons for compliance as well?

D: I'm not sure there are that many reasons. I think there's just the reason that there is this orthodoxy, and it's very, very powerful. It's been established with a quasi-religious fervour. I mean, it's a cultural phenomenon, and you can't ever entirely pin down the causes and sources and roots of cultural phenomena. They arise out of the culture, as though from countless places simultaneously, if you like.

They don't so much flow down from some kind of central villain, like Klaus Schwab or something, It's possible, just possible, there is some kind of mastermind or cabal behind this, but it seems to me highly unlikely. It's more that, you know, cultural phenomena just *emerge*, because we're all kind of one.

I suppose it's a Jungian thing: the collective unconscious. It can produce some very alarming phenomena. I think that's as good an explanation as any for how this hysteria and this orthodoxy came about. Where do cultural phenomena come from? These things just mysteriously arise in innumerable places simultaneously, don't they?

R: I might have asked you this before, I can't remember but if I haven't: What is a human?

D: It's a very good question. Again, I don't know the answer. I mean, I don't know where to start, it's such a huge question (laughs).

R: I've had a multitude of answers, like: “The biggest parasite on the planet,” “amazing things” and everything in between.

D: I honestly don't know where to go with that one.

R: Yeah, I mean, even the answer “I don't know,” is a perfectly legitimate answer in and of itself.

D: It's a good question. It's a good one to ponder on. Of course, it's unanswerable, like all philosophical questions. I'm tempted to address it through the issue of suffering. I sometimes think what a human is is someone that has a very particular and problematic relationship to suffering. I'm not sure that the other animals suffer in the same way.

R: Their conception of pain is different. There is an experience of pain yet there's not the anguish of pain.

D: Yes, that's not a bad way of putting it. That's what appears to be the case anyway. But of course, we also have this very interesting relationship to suffering in that we can enjoy it as well. A thinker who I'm a great admirer of, Adam Phillips, says somewhere that the fact that we can enjoy our suffering is both the best and the worst thing about us. This observation doesn't really get us anywhere, but seems to me very true.

Humans are creatures that have a unique and both very problematic – and at the same time perhaps, whatever the opposite of “problematic” is – relationship to suffering and that's because of this thing we have called consciousness. We can't be at peace with the mystery. We are conscious, but also conscious of our consciousness, and conscious of our suffering.

R: Yeah. Isn't that a Buddhist notion? That existence is suffering, and there's the whole Schopenhauerian thing too?

D: Yeah. I mean, consciousness is both the most incredible gift and the most awful curse. And yet, I suppose many people have somehow worked out how to be at peace with it, at least to some extent, mostly by forgetting about it I suppose.

R: Certainly a unique answer. Something I'll be thinking about on the way up for sure. So, as regards the situation then, what would you have done differently? Let's say you had the reins of power. Never give a lefty the reins of power! It's not all tractor production stats!

But in all seriousness, what would look different in David's world?

D: Well, I would never be in that kind of position. There's a well-known joke that seems applicable here. A man wandering in Ireland asks a farmer for the way to Tipperary, and the farmer says: “Well... I wouldn't start from here.” The point is that there's no sense in imagining what I would do if I had the reins of power, because I would be completely hampered to act from the position we are currently in, but where else can one act from? (There's an echo there of the title of Giorgio Agamben's most recent book, “Where Are We Now?”) From where we are now, there's nothing I could possibly do to make things better. And I don't mean from where we are now in November 2021. I mean from where this culture has been for a long time. The changes that need to be made are so radical, and ultimately they need to come from the individual and not from the culture at large. It would just be the most hilarious

farce to put me in charge, because there's nothing I can do from here. Because we're so far down the road of fuckedness, there's no way I could get it back.

The only hope now is for those of us who are trying to be individuals and who believe in the importance of individuality, to live our truth, to live our individuality and hope that the embracing of individual truth might spread like a virus. And that's really the only hope, I think. Even that's not really a hope, but we have to live like it is, because there's no other choice. You can't live with an awareness of utter despair. You have to have some kind of hope.

R: Something to look forward to, in a way.

D: But to answer your question in the most basic terms, what would I have done differently? Well, I wouldn't have done any of it. Had I been in charge there would have been no shutdowns, no face coverings, no "distancing", no injections, no mass testing. None of it. Hopefully that's fairly obvious.

R: Yeah,

D: If you look at places that have come closest to that, places like Sweden, they've fared much, much better than us if we are to believe the statistics. Of course, what statistics tell us can be as twisted as anything else, but it certainly seems to me that there's absolutely no evidence that any of these practices have had any effect whatsoever, in terms of people dying, which is what they're ultimately supposed to prevent.

R: And so what of your relationship with the state then? How has it been affected by this? I'm guessing you weren't a big fan of the idea of the state and that sort of hierarchy anyhow.

D: Well, it's been encouraging in some ways to find that actually you can just ignore all this stuff. And mostly it doesn't matter. It doesn't really have any effect on your life, on my life anyway. I mean, the bureaucratic machinery of the state is just mostly a bit of a comedy really. Although, again, starting from where we are now, we need some kind of state, we need some kind of government. You couldn't just instigate a kind of anarchy from this point, because it just wouldn't work.

Even if anarchy is the ideal condition for humans, which I think it might be, you couldn't do it now. It wouldn't work. It would probably be a complete disaster. Thinking in those kind of pragmatic terms about where we are now and the state, it isn't going anywhere. It's just going to get worse. Probably at the moment the state seems to me like it's a sort of dangerous idiot, but one that actually often ends up being quite benign. I just hope it stays that way. Things could be completely different in a few months' time.