

January 6 Riot LIVE! Helping to Propel the War on Domestic Terrorism and More

By [Michael Welch](#), [Joachim Hagopian](#), [Jonathan D. Simon](#),

and [Ryan Cristian](#)

Global Research, January 14, 2023

Region: [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [GLOBAL RESEARCH NEWS HOUR](#),
[Intelligence](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Politics](#),
[Terrorism](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in **51 languages** by activating the “**Translate Website**” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg_globalresearch.a](#)

“January 6th and the lies that led to insurrection have put two and a half centuries of constitutional democracy at risk. The world is watching what we do here.”

– U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee Chair Bennie Thompson [1]

“The most important point today from January 6th is: this was a setup. This was a psychological operation, in my opinion, meant to execute this larger thing we just discussed.”

- Ryan Cristian, from this week’s interview

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

[Click to download the audio \(MP3 format\)](#)

During a speech at the White House marking the second anniversary of the chaos that engulfed the U.S. Capitol, President Joe Biden remarked that “our democracy was attacked!”

“A violent mob of insurrectionists assaulted law enforcement, vandalized sacred halls, hunted down elected officials, all for the purpose of an attempt to overthrow the will of the people, and usurp the peaceful transfer of power. All of it fuelled by lies about the 2020 election.” [2]

He also mentioned and honoured the valiant efforts of police and election workers on this brand new “Day of Remembrance.”

“What would you think Mr President if tomorrow you woke up and you had a headline in the press saying that in the British Parliament you had a mob had

come down the hall, broken down the doors to the House of Commons, police officers were killed or died, the place was vandalized in order to overthrow the election of a speaker of the House, a Prime Minister's election. Think about it!" [3]

It was importantly also a big media event. The dramatic event broadcast live on all major news stations would be difficult for average citizens with access to any media to ignore. As with 9/11, the "threats, the violence, the savageness" accentuated by mainstream punditry helped craft the peril of this moment of profound partisan discord into a threat. But not from Islamic extremists or dangerous leaders of authoritarian countries. From Domestic Terrorists!

The enemy within.

The riot itself was triggered by the elections of 2020 which saw power slide away from Donald Trump toward Joe Biden. Trump, a number of electoral analysts, and [millions of voters](#), staring at unusual election activities, and said the election was rigged against the Republicans. In other words, the REAL coup against democracy was executed not by a "mob," but quietly beforehand when the power of the people at the voting booth was robbed by special interests.

The prominent media claimed Trump was repeating "false election fraud claims" before launching the thousands of upset supporters off on Washington. [4]

With a similar looking eruption of (righteous) outrage taking place in Brazil with [Bolsonaro supporters ransacking buildings](#) in Brasilia, including the Supreme Court, Congress, and the presidential palace, the January 6 event in the United States potentially has international as well as domestic repercussions. That's why this week on the Global Research News Hour, we will examine the riot and its spillover with greater attention.

In our first half hour, the journalist and author Joachim Hagopian joins us to explain why exactly there was more to Trump's loss than negative public reaction to his policies. He also shares how similar acts of rigging were in play during the Mid-Term elections. We also speak to a pioneer of electoral forensics, Jonathan Simon, who is of the view based on his own analysis, that most of the evidence of foul play points actually to the Republicans and about how Americans should and must work to get those red thumbs off the electoral scales.

In our second half hour, we have a long discussion with Ryan Cristian of [The Last American Vagabond](#). He will discuss how the January 6 event was largely staged and that the repercussions included not just a "War on Domestic Terrorists," but a pre-staged implication of Russians well before their attack on Ukraine this past year.

Joachim Hagopian is a journalist and commentator. He is a West Point graduate and former Army officer. After the military, Joachim earned a master's degree in Clinical Psychology and worked as a licensed therapist in the mental health field. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Jonathan D Simon is the former executive director of Election Defense Alliance (2006-16) and author of [CODE RED: Computerized Elections and The War on American Democracy: Election 2020 Edition](#).

Ryan Cristian is the Founder and Editor of [The Last American Vagabond](#), an independent

media critic, and recipient of the [Serena Shim Award For Uncompromising Integrity In Journalism](#).

(Global Research News Hour Episode 375)

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

[Click to download the audio \(MP3 format\)](#)

Transcript of Ryan Cristian, January 6, 2023

Global Research: It is a real treat for me right now to introduce Ryan Cristian to the stage. He is the founder and editor of The Last American Vagabond and he is a committed analyst of news. His work earned him the Serena Shim Award for uncompromising integrity in journalism. He has done amazing work exposing – exploring the Covid-19 situation, surveillance technology, and American foreign policy, among other subjects. But considering the date we are having this interview is January 6th, I thought it would be a good idea to explore what he has revealed about the famous riot on this date, taking place on Capitol Hill in Washington. He has definitely found evidence that there was more to it than a bunch of grumpy Trump supporters staging an insurgency because they are wicked. Rather, this event set the stage for events outside the theatre of political partisanship, to build up not only the fight against supposed domestic terrorism, but in support of prevailing narratives about Russia, and much, much more. Ryan Cristian, thank you for joining us on the Global Research News Hour. We are looking forward to the gems of investigation you are willing to share with our listeners.

Ryan Cristian: Well, thank you, Michael. It's an honour to be here. I'm looking forward to it. I definitely think this is – I mean, it's almost hard to say from a – people won't – I think it's more important than most people realize, put it that way. And which I mean, it's hard to say that, because most people see that there's something that's very important. But even then, it ties to so many more things than I think we've – a lot of people have patched together like you were touching on there in regards to foreign policy connections and even – honestly even ties to the Great Reset and Covid-19 and a lot of different things. So, thank you for having me on to talk about it, it's important. And on the day, on the anniversary of this gigantic psychological operation.

GR: Yeah, happy anniversary. The riot was an event where people were contesting the vote turnout, alleging voter fraud, or election rigging. There have been accusations in the past that the election was turned against Democrats in the past. Now they're turned against Republicans. But we saw people wanting to change, to charge forward. The courts were not contesting the election. But people charged forward. Remind our listeners, if you could, what particular anomalies were there in the media coverage of the riots that you felt seemed, in certain ways, untruthful or offside with what was known at that time.

RC: Hm, yeah. That's a gigantic – from my perspective, just about —

GR: Yeah.

RC: — literally everything that they did that day or ongoing from before or since then. But I think the important points to make —

GR: If you could just pick out – yeah.

RC: I'm sorry?

GR: Just pick out maybe a few, just a few highlights because we don't want it to dominate the discussion.

RC: Oh, right. Of course, of course. Yeah, but I would like to say first that I think it's important to note that, you know, anybody engaging in – even if they're wrong, by the way – questioning the outcome, the government's decisions, the statement by the media around an election, it's valid and important to be able to do that and that's something that's being shut down and it goes both ways. Historically speaking, I think are always – I view – to make it clear from the beginning – I view all this as a uni-party, as the government manipulating the people. Left-right paradigm stuff, I think, is what keeps people from seeing the full picture here.

Now, on the concept of the media and the coverage, I mean, from top-to-bottom – and again, I mean this in just about every topic we could point at today, but specifically focusing on January 6th – it was framed – like, the way I look at it, is it seems as if there was a narrative set about the way this was supposed to go, and the way it was supposed to be perceived, that very quickly did not pan out for any number of reasons we could get into, whether people were armed and they were – you know, being pressured to be armed. They didn't show up with any weapons, or whether they were being violent or not. And they had the narrative that it was supposed to look like. And it was almost as if the media and the government just stuck to the narrative and talking points, even as it quickly fleshed out to not be the way it was being presented as.

And so, the media was very quick to frame this as, 'Racist and misogynistic,' or whatever else, just as some kind of an insurgency active – activity. Right? That they were going there to take violent action against politicians. I mean, Pelosi was kind of insinuating it outright, saying this from the beginning, especially as it got more intense. And the way that they covered this was so inherently dishonest, and I think we see this in every aspect. And it was just about the way that they either were told to cover it, or the way that they were perceiving it, regardless of what was actually happening.

I mean, you can talk about the way that the engagement of the police that were on the ground and whether they were supposed to be called in, and they were turned down. And you know, all these things were ignored. Or whether they called it an "Armed insurrection," or "violence –" I mean, you know, there's all these examples that aren't just about the media coverage, but the way that it was ongoing since then. Right?

But I get it. I think from top-to-bottom, it was clearly dishonest, all the way to this very point. Even from a congressional standpoint, to call it something that it wasn't.

GR: Mm-hmm.

RC: Now, if you you'd like me to get into the things that —

GR: Yeah.

RC: — I do think were also wrong, I mean like – I'm not – there were things that were done

there, whether allowed to happen or not, that need to be pointed out, you know. The crimes that were committed, even if I do think they were minor, that were valid to point out, you know. The violence taken against people in authority – in a police position, or breaking windows, let's say, which is destruction of property, you know, these are things which should be pointed out. So, it's not to say that there was no – nothing that was done there that should be held accountable for. But it was represented as something so exponentially more serious than that, all the way to this point.

GR: Yeah. Well, there was also the images, because they're a series of different images and I mean, you saw them recycling over and over again, the people breaking into a window or something like that. And then, on the other hand, they were showing people walking down the main line as they entered, and they were walking, they weren't raiding it like a bunch of hooligans. They were staying within the lines of the – you know, as you enter, you —

RC: Yeah, —

GR: — know. And there are the – go ahead.

RC: I was just going to add to that, and that these are people that are being still framed on that same kind of, you know, over-the-top, hyperbolic statement about what they're supposed to be trying to accomplish. But you can very clearly tell that, by and large, a lot of these people were just kind of going along with the flow, not even realizing – like, I always often point out, if you were to come up to this after this has all begun and walked in, not realizing that things had already been kind of – like, I argue right there that even though they broke through the barriers after weirdly – when you talk about Ray Epps and how that seems to influence that. But break through these barriers, and then seemingly people were just allowed to keep coming in. Like, why wasn't there more people put in place to stop that? So, people wandered in essentially and were taking pictures and, you know, walking, staying between the velvet ropes and you know. So, at the very least, you could tell a lot of people weren't even aware, in and of themselves, that there was a problem and something happening that was perceived as violent. So, it just – it's kind of impossible to frame everybody there as violent attackers when half of them clearly didn't even realize what they were involved in. You know? It just – it screams psychological operation.

GR: Yeah. Could you talk about Ray Epps? Because, I mean, he was someone who was, I guess, appeared to be directing things.

RC: Even himself, I went over the transcript of the weirdly redacted and controlled release of the engagement of this committee. But Ray Epps on the record, said he did – he used his own word “orchestrate,” ‘that I helped orchestrate or that I orchestrated this.’ And then, he walks it back later in the conversation. But either way, you can clearly see on video him doing things that his own testimony seems to contradict. That was the first thing that stood out to be: the timing of it, whether or not he was telling – like, he was saying ‘We're going to go inside the Capitol.’ And people pushed back on that, even called him a Fed, you know, chanting, “Fed, Fed.” And all these videos have been seen, weirdly absent from the conversation of the January 6th committee, and also acting like they didn't even know who he was, despite being one of the main people put on the list by the FBI. All these weird omissions and things that don't make sense. But Ray Epps himself, was the most important point was there chanting, both on the 5th and the 6th, that we're going to be going inside the Capitol.

Anybody knows that's not allowed, especially in the context or – specifically in the context of how this was going. Now obviously you can go in the Capitol if they're – you know, in a normal setting or tours or whatever else. But in this context, it was very clear that if they were to march up there as a mob, or even just as a protest, and try to march in Capitol, they know that's not allowed. Right? So they – when he says that, he knows that he's saying 'We're going to do something that's going to put them on the defensive.' And then, that – so, you know that what he's doing is calling for action that will lead to conflict, whether it's violent conflict or political – he knows that. And yet, now he gets represented as some kind of patsy that was just there for peaceful protesting, except on the record repeatedly screaming, "We're going to go inside the Capitol," and then telling them that they're not going to – he even says once on the record, 'I'm worried about saying this, because this will get me in trouble, but we need to go inside the Capitol.' So, —

GR: Yeah.

RC: — clearly point out he knew it was a problem. And the point is —

GR: Was he —

RC: — is that guy got quickly kicked out of the conversation until way later when pushed by people like Thomas Massie and others to be talked about, you know, to be brought into the conversation, and it was very quickly pushed to the side. I mean, this was a 9/11 committee-style manipulation from the beginning, in my opinion.

GR: So, when the committee was investigating – doing their recent investigations, was he ever arrested? Or did they just leave him aside, but go after other individuals?

RC: I don't believe he was ever technically arrested. I believe that he was overlooked and intentionally overlooked for a long time, until way later in this process that they brought him in. But I think they just – I don't know, I don't have the full – I'm going to go ahead and say I don't know. But I think that he was invited, you know, via congressional subpoena to come in and testify. But we all know how wildly different that is, then even for example, some grandmother with a cell phone that actually got arrested and actually got charged for a crime, for doing something – for being present, despite the fact that he's the one out there screaming, "We're going to go in the Capitol." Right? So, you can just see a very different way they engage with people when, I mean – let's put it this way: when dealing with somebody they perceive to be a Trump supporter, they very clearly have dealt differently with them. But weirdly enough, the way that they engage with Epps seems to be from a perception of, 'He's being taken advantage of.' Now, why is that? Right? It doesn't make any other sense, any sense compared to how they treat everybody else. That doesn't prove anything, but it gives you examples of why I think it's pretty clear this person was an agent provocateur. That's my opinion, just my opinion.

GR: Has the committee investigated the possibility that these people were actually armed, or that some of these people were actually armed? Was there any individuals discovered carrying firearms?

RC: No, as far as I can tell. And again, I'll be – to be clear, I haven't fine tooth comb gone through everything that's been on transcripts from the January 6th committee. Frankly, I find it to be kind of a waste of time. Not that we shouldn't be doing it, but there's just so much else going on. But my point is that, what we know is that there was nobody armed there. If it

comes out later that one person was like personally carrying a gun, we know how that's going to be taken out of context.

Like for instance, saying that people were killed despite the only actual person being killed there was Babbitt who was shot by Capitol police. Right? Yet, they all still argue that people were killed there by the protestors. And that's even a stretch to argue that it was because of the protestors. That's a whole conversation we can get into if you want. But I think that what we know is that this was an unarmed protest.

And that was done for a very clear reason: because it was – it was discussed amongst these circles long before this started, that they were being set up. Right? So, this was known. And so, an entire – like, the whole sentiment, even to this day, is that it was an armed insurrection. There are still politicians saying that, even though it's been very clearly proven that wasn't the case. You know? So, my point in saying that in the beginning was: I bet you you could flesh this out to the point to where you'll find out somebody was legally carrying. Somebody may be allowed to. Or more importantly, that we know that there were different people that were at the lead positions of some of these militias that turned out to be FBI. Or a woman that worked for a psychological operations department. I believe it was for the military, the Navy, I forget the exact location. But all this was discussed openly at the time. They are there of their own capacity, they claim, but except the FBI one. The point being is that there are probably examples of some kind of firearm at this large event. Point being, it was an unarmed insurrection, and that speaks volumes.

GR: Okay —

RC: Or, excuse me. I should —

GR: So, —

RC: — well, hold on —

GR: — did you —

RC: — I have to correct that: I didn't mean to say, "Insurrection." The point is, an unarmed protest that they call an "Insurrection." Important correction. Go ahead.

GR: Okay. Well, you're talking about this whole situation, including the media, seeming to just set up, you know, the parade – the protestors for – you know, basically criminalizing them. That suggests, because there's a history of this sort of thing, that maybe there were agent provocateurs involved. I mean, are there any that come to mind, any individuals that you would say, okay, that that guy smells like a provocateur?

RC: Well, Ray Epps is an obvious example. I mean, whether he – whether that was what he was being paid to do or not, that's what he was doing. Period. Right? And he was out there going, 'We're going in the Capitol. We're going to do this, follow me. The Capitol's this way.' So, orchestrating. That's exactly what – the word he even used.

So, I can't prove that he did it on behalf of somebody else, but that's my opinion and I think it's pretty obvious, based on all the things we've already said. The way they engage with them, the way they didn't go after him, on and on and on.

But there's more than that. I mean, you can see examples of – there's examples of Antifa

members that have been caught on the record – their own videos, by the way – speaking both before, pretending to be Trump supporters, telling people to go in the Capitol. Telling them to do things that were against the law. And then, on video – which many people have copies of – running afterwards, saying, ‘We did it. We got them, we tricked them.’ I don’t think they use the word “trick,” but basically, ‘We got them, we got them to do it. They get – they went inside.’ It’s all on the record.

And then, you can prove that the guy, the – I forget... I don’t remember if they ever got his name, but the dark-skinned, dark-haired guy that was proven to be a member of Antifa. On, you know, his own social media profiles. So, whether again that was at the behest of some kind of government organization or intelligence, we don’t know. But obviously, they were there with dishonest intentions to either set up the MAGA people or frame them for a government agenda, or something. There’s an obvious example, verifiably, of an agent provocateur.

But you’ll never find that video, which is literally everywhere when – you know, in these conversations in the January 6th committee. Now why would that be? It’s record, it’s on the record, it’s provable, you know. They just don’t want to factor that in, they call it conspiracy theory.

But there’s endless examples of these kind of factors playing in any of these things, including – I would argue in a reverse sort of way – the allowance of people to go through certain areas and barriers and doors. You know, it’s not necessarily agent provocateurs, but in a reverse way they’re sort of doing so in the hope that they take some kind of action that they can then frame as being what they want it to be. You know? I mean, we could speak about Pelosi and the Capitol police, and how numerous calls were made to bring in reinforcements and it was turned down numerous times.

Or even before January 6th, speaking on the record, saying, ‘We need more people, we know what’s coming. We have this planned,’ and doing nothing about it. You know? It’s very obvious that this was at least allowed to happen, which is a classic tenet of US foreign policy and examples throughout. You know, Pearl Harbor, for example, it’s one of those examples.

GR: Now I want to talk about, you know, other aspects of it. It’s not just about Trump versus the Democrats and some Republicans, like Vice President Pence, for example. You were also talking about expanding it to the point where we are actually looking forward to, you know, what would transpire in Ukraine. I’m thinking there’s an individual that was parading around with face paint and a buffalo hide, I think. Very noticeable.

RC: Mm-hmm.

GR: You dug into his background and discovered a lot of interesting things as well on the record. Can you describe some of the things – into his background? And his buddy, as well, Dybynyn I believe his name is. It causes one to wonder about what they were doing there.

RC: Yeah, yeah. Well, there’s a lot of really interesting overlap there, and I am going to ask you – I had actually forgotten about this point, because I am looking forward to getting into the Ukraine overlap here, and Project Aerodynamic and all of this and Rise Above Movement. Before that, though, with – I’m glad you said that, I had actually forgotten about

the Ukrainian individual that was there, pretending to be Russian, as one of these individuals.

This is all stuff that's been fleshed out on the record. You can see the social media profiles. And this is an individual that was there alongside specifically the guy with the horns and that guy that was this prominent individual. But in numerous other examples as well, and is seen wearing the Azov colours and symbols before this. Seen wearing the Right Sector information. You know, all of - very interesting stuff. And so, the point was, to make it very concise for people, is that we have an individual directly tied to the Azov movement in Ukraine in this event acting like a Russian. Screaming things in Russian. All of this is easily provable. We went over this in our own January 6th coverage.

Without knowing what we're going to get into next, that wouldn't make much sense. But what's important to understand - unless you wanted to make a further point on that - is how that, in my opinion I think provably connects with what has been a long sought agenda to create this exact situation, but ultimately blame the rise of what they claim is white supremacy, and so on. Or rather, what they claim is the rise of white supremacy and all these racist nut ideas because of Russia, despite the fact that I can prove to you this was a CIA agenda that's been built. Just like the Mujahadeen, Afghanistan, Soviet Union play in Ukraine in order to blame specifically people that they call Republicans, but just anybody in this country that pushes back.

I'm happy to get into all that overlap there, but, unless you want to go further on that Ukraine guy. Because that's such an interesting point that nobody really talks about.

GR: Yeah. Well, I think when you said "Mujanadeen" [SIC] you meant Mujahadeen in Afghanistan, right? Because we were - you were supporting, you know, the same people - we were supporting the Mujahadeen which were doing a lot of nefarious and evil things. But now you've got a white equivalent, if you will, doing these things.

RC: Yeah, no —

GR: But, —

RC: — I was —

GR: — yeah.

RC:— referencing the Mujahadeen in Afghanistan and Soviet Union overlap. Right? That they did —

GR: Yeah.

RC: — the same thing in arming a fascist entity to use them against the Soviet Union. Right? Which later became Al-Qaeda, later became ISIS. My point is, you're showing that they have a play - the playbook, right? Where they will happily engage with the people that they later call terrorists in order to use it against somebody that they perceive as an enemy.

Right? The Mujahadeen in Afghanistan against Soviet Union is the same game they're playing right now with the fascist neo-Nazis and Nazis in Ukraine to use against Russia. And it's the same game, it's very interesting.

GR: Yeah. And I'm just talking briefly, like maybe in just a couple of minutes you could talk about the Ukrainians in this situation. Because they met in the past or – yeah, it was in the past in Donetsk, I think. There was a picture of the two of them together. So, well, okay how is it that we're – that this group of angry Americans has these individuals from Ukraine speaking Russian to American citizens?

RC: Well, I don't know exactly how this individual came to be there, like as the – you know, it happened. And what's important to understand is to flush out the background of why that makes sense or why it's important. I mean, I could make this quick, but there's a whole bunch to unpack around this and the point that is what you can prove today.

First of all, is that there is Project Aerodynamic in 1948 to today, is a CIA operation to build fascism in Ukraine to use against Russia. Or first the Soviet Union, but now against Russia. And it's ongoing. I mean, this is on the record CIA documentation where they picked up a guy named Mykola Lebed who was a Nazi war criminal, who was actually sentenced to death in Poland, and then was saved by the US government and was used both in New York and in Ukraine to head up a company called Prolog. And this was a media company. And this is a Nazi war criminal, they knew that. And so, this guy was the basis for what grew to this day.

It became less – the point is it was ongoing. Who knows to the level they were still using this, up until around 2014, when we saw the Maidan Square regime change. Which, by the way, is also on the record knowing that they knew who actually shot people, which was the US-backed entities and they framed the other side, sort of like Syria.

Now the point is that that created a new government and since – from that point forward, the agenda really kicked off, and there was articles written about this. That's when this truly began, what we're seeing today in the context of the, you know, invasion of February 25th. Now, a lot happened before that, but that was like the real re-initiation of this agenda as far as I can tell.

Now that began in the concept of trying to create and grow that fascist entity, neo-Nazis and Nazis, in Ukraine to be able to blame it on Russia and the influence of that around the world. Because we all saw every corporate media outlet, pre-February 25th, was writing about the neo-Nazi problem in Ukraine and suddenly it just vanished when it became something – it's very transparent.

The important part to see here is that they were building this for the game of blaming it actually on Americans, as far as I can tell. And to make that point clear, the Rise Above Movement, which is the movement in the United States that was in Charlottesville that kind of was the beginning point for this white supremacy conversation around the Trump movement and MAGA. Right? They were the ones with the tiki torches marching down the street in Charlottesville. You know, what was it, "They will not replace us," or whatever they were saying.

Now, people don't know that that is verifiably, even according to Newsweek, the US arm, the faction of the Azov movement in the United States. Why that's not discussed is obvious, because that's not supposed to be traced back to the CIA. Because once the CIA documentation and this conversation got really fleshed out, that kind of fell apart.

But the whole point is, we having a rising white supremacy threat in this country. And if you trace the lines they were making, that was supposed to be laid at the feet of Russia and their efforts to do this and, you know, create the white supremacy threat. But if we know that the CIA was raising and growing this Azov movement group, along with Right Sector and Svoboda and all the other Nazi elements in this country. And then we know that that arm of that agenda was what created the conversation in the United States with the Rise Above Movement, as well as other groups: CasaPound, in Germany, they're all over the world. We know that the CIA is the group that is responsible for this, at least in part, and yet that doesn't get discussed.

And now, this has been spinning out of control and all they want to try to do is frame this as some kind of rising white supremacy, Nazi, fascist mentality. Well, the US government is openly arming the most obvious Nazi elements in the world right now in Ukraine, and working directly with the most openly fascist government I would argue, which is Israel's government. And it's very interesting that – the point – no, you tell me where you want to go from there. But the point is to realize that I think this has been carefully crafted to blame anybody freely thinking in this country, and I don't just think Republicans.

I mean, they call me a Republican, I scream two-party illusion. But anybody pushing back. And that kind of fell apart with the Ukraine agenda, but it's still going forward, so. It's very interesting and very concerning. I call it the MAGA trap or the Vanilla ISIS psy-op.

GR: Probably be our last point, but the idea also is that you're building up resistance to what they call domestic terrorism. So, it's not terrorists, just you know, Islamic terrorists or those people outside the country. There is a domestic terrorist entity building within the country. And —

RC: Yeah.

GR: — there are all sorts of references, you know, among the people who – even before January 6th, people were making note of this. And then, boom, along comes the riot. And all of a sudden they have free – it's kind of like where when 9/11 happened, they just pulled up the Patriot Act which was written before 9/11 and —

RC: Right.

GR: — put it out there to vote on. So, if you could just briefly talk about the – that mode of using this on Americans to divide them and —

RC: Yes.

GR: — the created terrorist threat which is going to build up a lot of monetary control, and other controls to stop it.

RC: Yeah, it's a great place to wrap – to, you know, bring this to, the domestic terrorism angle. We have to remember that Biden wrote an executive order overlapping just basic misinformation with the concept of domestic terrorism. Right? So, we already see this effort to argue that if you challenge the vaccine agenda, that you're suddenly not just dangerous, which is not even the – you know, words are not violence. But over the top of that, that you are a domestic terrorist, that you're actually killing people. We saw people like Hotez make this argument on the vaccine.

The same point is happening around all of this, that they – this is all meant to kind of converge, in my mind, around the idea that you are a – there's the domestic terrorist threat, but that's the white supremacy threat and that comes from the outside. That's their clumsy narrative. That's where Vanilla ISIS got thrown out. That somehow, these white supremacists are so – I mean, I don't even know how they try to piece together that you're a white supremacist yet you work with foreign entities that are not white, but that's what they're doing, Iran and so on.

But that's where the Russia angle came in. And we have to remember the groups like The Base – which by the way is the literally translation for the term Al-Qaeda, it translates to The Base in English – is a group that was based out of Russia, that only went there about 2018. But it was founded by a guy that worked for the DHS, for the US government at top secret clearance, and used to work on counter-terrorism, and just one day woke up and said, 'I'm now a white supremacist, I'm going to go live in Russia and start a group.' These things I think aren't supposed to be so clear.

My point is I think it's obvious this was built to create that exact thing that you're pointing out. The domestic terrorism threat that stems from the bad guy, so it swings in all the foreign policy, despite this being built by the CIA and other groups. That overlaps with the overarching point of where this is all going, whether it's the bio-security state direction or anything. It comes down to what you think is most important.

But as Whitney Webb has coined in the past that, you know, today under the security state, right, the idea was about fighting the idea of the boogeyman overseas and then ultimately realizing that it was turned in against us. But today, the bio-security state, your body is the new battlefield. Right? So, we now see how it's been inverted even though it's always kind of been that way, directly pointed at us. Even calling – you know, the domestic terrorism threat is the biggest rising threat.

So, I think this has been planned and I think we're watching executed moves that bring this together in a larger way that, if you want me to touch on it, I think do connect with the Covid-19 agenda and where that all goes. But regardless, the most important point today from January 6th is: this was a setup. This was a psychological operation, in my opinion, meant to execute this larger thing we just discussed. Right? That was the point where they were going to say, 'See, we told you. They're violent, they tried to overthrow the government, and it all ties back to Russia.' That's what I think this really was. And you can prove it ties back to the CIA. It's alarming.

GR: Well, Ryan, it's great to have you on the show and I think maybe we can pick up on this at a later date. But we're going to close for now. Thank you so much for being a guest on my show. And as always, we'll allow our listeners to think for themselves thoroughly. Thank you for being our guest.

RC: Thank you, Michael. Appreciate it. Looking forward to next time.

The [Global Research News Hour](#) airs every Friday at 1pm CT on [CKUW 95.9FM](#) out of the University of Winnipeg. The programme is also podcast at [globalresearch.ca](#).

Other stations airing the show:

CIXX 106.9 FM, broadcasting from Fanshawe College in London, Ontario. It airs Sundays at 6am.

WZBC 90.3 FM in Newton Massachusetts is Boston College Radio and broadcasts to the greater Boston area. The Global Research News Hour airs during Truth and Justice Radio which starts Sunday at 6am.

Campus and community radio [CFMH 107.3fm](#) in Saint John, N.B. airs the Global Research News Hour Fridays at 7pm.

CJMP 90.1 FM, Powell River Community Radio, airs the Global Research News Hour every Saturday at 8am.

Caper Radio CJBU 107.3FM in Sydney, [Cape Breton](#), Nova Scotia airs the Global Research News Hour starting Wednesday afternoon from 3-4pm.

[Cowichan Valley Community Radio CICV 98.7 FM](#) serving the [Cowichan Lake](#) area of Vancouver Island, BC airs the program Thursdays at 9am pacific time.

Notes:

1. https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/22057379-thompson_openingstatementpreparedfordelivery
2. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YexrmlBPvt8>
3. ibid
4. [Patricia Zengerle](#) and [Richard Cowan](#) (June 10, 2022), 'U.S. Capitol riot hearing shows Trump allies, daughter rejected fraud claims', Reuters; <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/trump-aides-words-take-center-stage-us-capitol-riot-hearings-open-2022-06-09/>

The original source of this article is Global Research

Copyright © [Michael Welch](#), [Joachim Hagopian](#), [Jonathan D. Simon](#), and [Ryan Cristian](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Michael Welch](#),
[Joachim Hagopian](#),
[Jonathan D. Simon](#), and
[Ryan Cristian](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance

a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca