

Video: The Technocratic Dictatorship: Sacrifice or Revolt? Why the "Why-question" Is Not Asked

By [Prof. Claudia von Werlhof](#)
Global Research, December 06, 2021

Theme: [Environment](#)
In-depth Report: [Climate Change](#)

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).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

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

Every child asks questions. Questions on the why of things, the when, the who, the where and the how.

Adults do not so often ask such questions. Especially not, when these are of utmost significance and urgency – such as in today's comprehensive crisis pertaining to nature, society, civilization and life itself.

Why not?

One example of this lack of questioning can be seen in the movie "Technocratic Dictatorship". This too seems true when it comes to deep reflection and highly critical analysis, offering, one would hope, more than just scepticism on the current situation, but also outrage.

Those interviewed in this movie, myself among them, describe in various ways the dilemma of our times, which is the undisputable progressive destruction of the environment, nature and life on earth.

Primarily, the interviewees analyse modern natural sciences and technology as the main contributors to this destruction. The mechanistic world view of the modern era and its subsequent technology are seen as the major cause of this destruction, its technology being broadly conceptualized in terms of machine-technology.

They agree: contrary to all predictions and promises, so-called progress has not resulted in the improvement for humankind, for life itself, nature and the environment. Quite the contrary, it has instead led to a situation which threatens to become a technocratic dictatorship, as the movie's title aptly indicates.

From destruction of nature to the destruction of the human being?

Alongside the destruction of nature, the possible destruction of the human being itself

seems to be the agenda.

For the last half of a century, the process of "depopulation", i.e. the reduction in numbers of humans living on the Planet, is repeatedly mentioned in corresponding publications, especially among "techno-fetishists", as a declared necessity. Is this a "logical" continuation of the hitherto existing destruction of nature and life itself since the beginning of the modern era?

Is the often discussed project of so-called "transhumanism" a continuation of the technological progress "beyond" nature and humans?

Is it part of the agenda to abolish humans as a natural occurrence and species? To unhinge and transform them via technological inventions so that man may be adapted and custom-made to fit into the "mega-machine"?

One has to ask oneself: Is this achievable? Can it be possible anyone desiring such an experiment? Is it even possible anyone could have this as an aim? It seems the technological progress of today has led to an altered perspective on life and even human beings that most people are not yet aware of.

What would such a development toward "beyond human" look like in reality? The current propaganda advertising of such continued progress promises the improvement and higher development of humankind, to become even "god-like"- a homo deus (Harari). And in continuation of this sort of thinking, the „merging“ of human beings with the machine (Kurzweil) is considered an advanced development, allegedly leading to a new level of "evolution".

How is one to imagine this? Or: what does the logic of invention of a "post" -human "machine-being" or a "human machine", have to do with the sacrifices demanded for centuries from nature and all other life forms in the name of progress?

Are we not experiencing the creation of the promised "brave new world", with an equally "brave new human being" afterall (Sorgner), but rather an actual human sacrifice, being started under the disguise of technological progress by the big players of our civilization themselves, possibly already on a global scale?

What monstrosity! Where have we got to, if we have to ask such a question?

But, no one seems to be asking!

Watch the full movie below or [click here](#).

Why no one is asking "why"

Our movie shows that so far there is no reaction to the planned politics of implementing these depopulation-fantasies and the intended de-, trans- and posthumanisation of the human being.

Are people willing to put up with this? Do they believe – as it is often the case – the promises made from above and / or do they not (yet) understand what is really approaching them?

The movie asks no further questions. It ends with a prospect of a different, more environmentally friendly civilization and world, without having explained or explored WHY we have arrived at exactly the opposite, with or without science.

Furthermore, the question of if and how we can get out of the current state and arrive at an alternative civilization remains unexplored – and that is, still as human beings in the true sense, i.e. as living, creative and self-empowered creatures.

Given the discrepancy between everyday consciousness of "regular" people and the completely different dimensions in which the latest projects of technological progress are embedded, such a transition with a desired Happy End is obsolete.

Such a Happy End would somehow have required a discussion between the inventors and the objects, i.e. the victims of such progress, a requisite debate in which a solution would have been reached resulting in the "rejection" of such kind of progress.

First of all, the existing gap needs to be defined as one between the "wrong" consciousness of the people who are not the least aware of the existential threat they are subjected to, and the consciousness of those who, according to their own ideas have already begun, with supporting propaganda, to implement this threat.

The fundamental "why"- question is not posed: Why does hostility towards nature and human beings exist in modern civilization? This question is not asked in the movie, nor in the remaining fields of life. It seems no one is even noticing the absence of this key question.

The impression is given that it is not necessary to ask such a question: the movie states if natural science is oriented towards the dead instead of towards life, then this obviously becomes the reason why no attention is paid to the fact of life, nor to an (ethically) appropriate appreciation of the living world – the animate life.

However, such an argument is a circular one. It is tautologic.

And why is it like this?

Is natural science too ignorant to comprehend that the living also exists and how central it is to everything? If this were the case, it would be relatively easy to solve the problem.

However, the assumption of ignorance or an error on the part of natural science of course cannot count, even though both frequently occur. Because, the long held knowledge and understanding in times before natural science was developed, did not doubt the existence of the living force of nature and its meaning.

So what has happened that has led to the belief that the living force is, supposedly, no longer relevant, that it can be "omitted" from any consideration and now, even from reality itself – including the reality of the human being?

The anticipated "machine-being" of natural science and technological progress is precisely not supposed to be an augmentation of human aliveness in its original sense. What kind of development has taken place that allows for and openly anticipates a state of existence that is a false existence, being claimed as the new "normal", which can be described as a general state of non-life?

What kind of a strange self-fulfilling prophesy is at play here, that such untruth is now supposed to become a concrete reality?

Might this be because the alleged science of *nature* is in fact pursuing other interests, other from the investigation of truth and its effects on earthly conditions, and other from its inherent order, preventing those pursuing these other interests from seeing, respecting and honoring the "whole" – making money with the dead, which by implication also means making profits with murdering?

Is it capitalism, war and profit-making that have narrowed the field of natural science in this way, luring it onto a false path, which cannot easily be admitted to, nor walked away from? In this case, the question should be: why is natural science still considered a science and in fact *the* science? And finally, why is it the same under conditions of socialism and communism, i.e. in systems that are not profit-oriented per se? So-called "scientific and technological progress" in these systems is not on a different path, rather the contrary is the case.

Finally, irrespective of the money involved, why are people putting up with the destruction of their earthly environment – their only existing living sphere, to be finally confronted – in a strange logic – with their own extinction in the end?

The old saying "don't do something to others that you do not wish to experience yourself..." holds true. Why did it not do so with respect to progress?

Could anthropocentrism, i.e. the well-known perception of man being the "crown of creation" be responsible, an overall claim to power, giving permission to appropriate and destroy everything? So the idea that the same could happen to man himself does not even occur to him? Besides who would put him in such danger? Were people forced to destroy the non-human world, without being able to successfully raise their voice in opposition to this? Or did they do this voluntarily? If so, why?

Anthropocentrism, in complete contrast, could also have consisted of feeling especially responsible for life and could have resulted in even developing stewardship for life everywhere. Why has this, at least in the modern era, rarely been the case?

The reversal: destruction as a way to creation?

Is it possible that the destruction is not being perceived as such? Or could it be that it appears as its very opposite, i.e. serving as the foundation for an "improved" creation – including the creation of man himself?

Is the "why-question" on the destruction not asked because it is assumed not to be the case, but rather – the other way around – it is seen as the path to progress, to assumed abundance and betterment, always associated with progressive change?

The economist Joseph Schumpeter states that in capitalism an economically motivated destruction results in an even greater creation, i.e. the economic growth, which supposedly even exceeds the damage done. Accordingly, progress and specifically in this case, economic progress, cannot be achieved without losses, but progress, in principal, would always surpass the latter.

Karl Marx has called it the "development of the productive forces", namely those techniques

that would guarantee the steady increase of excess in production. However, he also anticipated that "the wellspring of riches, the earth and the laborer" would eventually run dry. Since that time science and technology have been striving to eliminate the wellspring of riches – named "laborer" – in the future, indeed. However, the ebbing of this well would not be left to occur naturally, it would, rather, be created intentionally – the reasons for and consequences of this ebbing being the subject of this debate.

On the whole, it seems to be about defining the problem of destruction and its subsequent measurement – whether as temporary or long-term, whether as collateral damage or a basic problem of the mode of production and of progress the costs of which have so far been "externalized". They have been outsourced, moved to an obscure "external" field becoming invisible and unaccountable. In this way, these costs appear to be non-existent.

In the end, the debate about the problem of the "necessary" destruction resulted in taking the destruction as such for granted, but not to be taken seriously as a significant objection to the modern era per se and its mode of production, science and technology.

Goethe wrote about this dilemma in Faust II and was the first to grapple with increasing horror, finding the words to describe the consequences of this decision. Then he fell silent, as his interpreter, the philosopher Michael Jaeger noticed (Jaeger). Goethe proved correct. Since then the destruction of the world has advanced rapidly, never to be reversed, halted or at least slowed down, not to mention any larger attempts of reparations. Instead, a radical nihilism has made its way towards all existence and being in the world (Severino) including the related acceptance of human sacrifice. In "Faust" it is the pre-modern elders, Philemon and Baucis, who had to yield to progress with their death.

Who will have to yield today?

Progress as the spawning of the "more" and furthermore, of the "better" remains largely uncontested. No one has successfully blocked its path. Any possible challenging has been declared a global taboo.

This is the reason why the "why-question" has not been asked and is still not being asked.

Apparently the question is superfluous, because it is allegedly about the common good and advancement. Progress remains beyond being challenged. The "why-question" would have merely resulted in the answer: one destroys in order to produce something more and better, according to the motto: you can't make an omelet without breaking eggs. Who would have doubted that in this process the more and the better is achieved?

Or: who would have wanted to abstain from progress, whatever it produces? Progress appeared to be completely without any alternative.

This remains so to this very day. Those who question progress became objects of ridicule. They appeared to be backward, even reactionary, uninformed, romantic, naïve or lost in the stone age.

Thus the question, why this path of development was necessarily destructive and to what degree, was dropped. Practical alternatives to such progress did not succeed in being implemented or sustained. Most notably, these could not effect any change on the apparent unstoppable path of progress.

The question, why there was such an adamantine clinging to this progress – even when it became increasingly obvious what it really meant for the world, initially called “silent spring” by Rachel Carson during the 1960’s (Carson), now commonplace – continued to be swept under the carpet.

The why-question was and is not posed, in spite of all the warning signs, such as the observed rapid extinction of animals and plants or the continual ozone-depletion in the atmosphere, because the preconditions for asking this question are simply renounced. There is massive denial of the situation; that it could have been progress itself responsible for the tremendous destruction, which at this point can no longer be ignored, and which in the meantime has begun to even threaten the very living conditions on earth, including the existence of mankind.

Who is to be blamed? The so-called “man-made” destruction.

In the meantime, the culprits are being searched for elsewhere, as now there is no longer any way around finding the responsible ones. Since the investigations by the Club of Rome during the 1970’s – e.g. on “the limits of growth”- all of a sudden the defacto comprehensive destruction is allowed for – however, funnily enough, now from above. Furthermore, this is still taking place without the “why-question” being asked. Were this not so one could not avoid taking progress itself under scrutiny. Instead, a futuristic and much “improved” form of progress has been outlined and comes with the intention to abolish most of all previous forms across the board. The reasons, therefore, are not to be found in any possible faults with the progress-project itself. The all-of-a-sudden discovered environmental – and nature – crisis is now blamed on “man” in general.

The crisis is being defined as a “man-made” crisis.

This applies to today’s so-called climate crisis and equally to the corona-pandemic as an alleged health crisis since 2020: neither the inventors of progress nor its enforcers and profiteers, since centuries, are accused of having done anything wrong. Instead, it is supposedly now “the people”, who, because of their sheer numbers, their consumer behavior, or their ignorance and carelessness are to be blamed for each particular disaster.

Supposedly there are too many of them, who consume too much, who do not follow the rules and overburden nature. They are defined as too dangerous because they are alive and in contact with one another and thus, generally suspicious. According to the declared agendas of the ruling elites, progress based on the hitherto existing industrial revolution is supposed to be brought to a halt.

Alongside the UN-agendas 2010 and 2030, the policies of the “Great Reset” of the World Economic Forum (WEF) and the “Green New Deal” of the EU and the US are openly discussed and explain to us how this is to take place. What is being revealed is an agenda for nothing less than a new world order in the form of a dictatorship (Rifkin 2019; Schwab/Malleret 2020)!

In this process, the why-question is still avoided, but nevertheless apparently answered. The answer is already there, before the question itself is posed.

Were it not so, i.e. the answer coming from above, it would have been noticed that something was wrong with this response. The problem with progress and the destruction it

causes is not simply "man-made" as the answer reads to the unposed question.

But the destruction is inherent in the system, i.e. it is *system-made*. This in particular should *not* be revealed because obviously those who run the system are interested in holding on to it – until the very end.

Those who have invented this model of progress and who – as a class – over centuries have enforced it by fire and by sword worldwide, even against strongest resistance, are now applying the brake. This full on brake is to indicate the end of the progress orchestration, the one which caused and operated this destruction in the first place, which now all of a sudden is recognized, but not admitted to as being due to its own failure. Rather it is seen as the failure of the "people", who are accused of pushing the planet to the limit of what's possible, and even beyond. Already humanity is in need of two or three earths, only to keep up with consumption and there is a threat that "peak oil" will be followed by more peaks, e.g. with rare earths, lithium or coltan, if not even the "peak of everything".

It is becoming obvious now, raw supplies are running short. Who, however, was it in the first place who pretended that the production of commodities was supposed to be never ending? Who chased the farmers off their land where they produced their own livelihood, and who ended their mass revolts against this expulsion with arms and wars? Who manoeuvred them into the factories of the industrial revolution and profited endlessly from their labor in the name of progress, and from controlling the consumption market which replaced the subsistence economy?

And who enforced, via inquisition, torture and burning stakes, that women would lose control of their bodies and reproductive capabilities, rendering them as "house-wives" to produce ever more laborers-to-be, exploited through this progress, from the colonies to the "motherlands"? Where else were the profits to come from if not from this labor force? (Werlhof et al. 1983)

This history of excessive violence over centuries, its reasons, methods, institutions and wrong-doers is simply being omitted from the new narrative of a "man-made" crisis. The perpetrators are obviously not even considered to be like other human beings even though what they did was also "man-made".

Consequently, this term today is reserved for "the people", that is the "masses".

The "elite" is exempt from it. "The people" are now accused of the mistakes, which those human beings belonging to the elite have forced them to commit, by employing all possible means for the last 500 years. In conclusion, "man-made" is an invention from above – the system of the elite itself.

The information war

There is an information war going on, in which those above decide which questions can be asked, what the problem is and how it may be defined, which "narrative" and associated explanations belong to it and how this is to be handled. In the meantime, almost everyone adheres to this, official media as well as "science", and all those who do not ask or do not allow any questioning. For, questions regarding the behavior of the elite are automatically considered "conspiracy theories", because they question this very behavior or could pose questions regarding it. Thus it becomes clear where the term "conspiracy theory" actually

comes from. Included in this is the "why"- question. In fact, it ranks first place. This question is simply forbidden.

At the moment, according to the official discourse – the one from above – there is a threat of climate-collapse because of a steadily increasing heating up of the atmosphere since the beginning of industrialization, which is now leading to a climate catastrophe which threatens all life on earth. The tailor-made reason for this is supposedly – solely – the emission of alleged greenhouse gas, CO₂, of civil industry and civil consumption, in addition to CO₂-increasing population growth. As a consequence, the extend of harmful, damaging climate change is "man-made" in the sense of being allegedly caused by human behavior today.

Here the circle of blame is closed on the narrative of who is responsible for the alleged problems, and the silence about the real problems of today.

CO₂, however, cannot develop a greenhouse gas effect because the earth is not a greenhouse. CO₂ is rather an invisible plant gas and not some dirty emission as commonly portrayed. It develops during the rotting of organic material and is used by plants for growth alongside oxygen, without which we could not even breathe or live life on earth. Thus, CO₂ is a very useful and essential gas.

Currently it makes up only 0,04 % of the atmosphere and of which only a fraction develops from human activities. Man-made CO₂, all of a sudden, is deemed responsible for the threat of global warming. In this information war, the fact that in previous times CO₂ was observed to be the *result* of a warming, not its cause, is utterly suppressed.

For over twenty years now, the new narrative is being repeatedly preached from above, especially by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, (IPCC), one of the political organizations closely affiliated with the UN who projects an image of being the purest and most highly developed place in science. The IPCC thereby merely reveals, how much science today – again and again – operates in the service of other interests, different from an alleged pursuit of knowledge and search for the truth (Werlhof 2021).

It is no different in the case of the so-called Corona-pandemic (e.g. Bhakdi 2020; generally globalresearch.ca 2020/2021). This means we have to investigate how the supposedly man-made – instead of system-made – climate and health-crisis is related to progress and its continuation, despite its damaging effects. Or rather, we have to investigate what new forms this progress with its inherent destruction will now take.

Stoppage of the progress to date and the enforcement of a new form of progress – the "4th industrial revolution"

In the meantime it is deemed to be clarified how the current form of progress is to be brought to a halt, that is through the dismanteling of civil production and its consumption according to the model of the industrial revolution hitherto. Instead, the building-up of a "CO₂-neutral" production and their consumption on the basis of renewable energies, replacing non-renewable, "dirty" energies is to take place. The old forms, i.e. coal, oil and gas, supposedly lead to too much CO₂-production. The new energies are intended to no longer produce much CO₂, and should come from sun, wind and water as well as from other sources such as bio-mass.

In this context, it is clear to all participating parties that all forms of power generated in this

way will not be available in ample supply. In order for to achieve enough energy-supply, drastic measures for the reduction of global energy demands would be necessary, i.e. of population! As it is the people who, according to the planning strategy, are the ones who would be in need of this energy. Otherwise suitable measures and technologies would need to be also developed and licenced. Instead, the solution seems to be at hand – the path to be taken is the "depopulation"- project.

The consequence of a corresponding depopulation is openly addressed, e.g. from the group "Vegans for Future", a subgroup of Fridays for Future (FFF), which is a youth movement, organized and directed from above (Ripple et al; a critique in pbme 2019).

Depopulation was already recommended when the problem of a "population bomb " (Ehrlich) was identified for the first time which, according to the theories of Thomas Malthus, would necessarily lead in the end to human starvation.

Within the controversial debate on vaccination, especially in the context of Covid- 19, depopulation as a possible aim has surfaced again. Last, but not least, through Bill Gates himself (Matters 2021) and his project – via the world health organization (WHO) – to vaccinate, for the first time in history, the entire population of the world. That this is not about a vaccination, but rather about something very different indeed, is becoming increasingly obvious.

Furthermore, the new forms of energy, which are supposed to reduce the alleged climate-damaging effects of production and consumption by the civil population are far from being so "innocent", "clean" and "green" as propagated. The manufacturing of certain components such as wind turbines and generators require high tech and heavy industry. Their periodic renewal as well as disposal represents an ecological disaster as there is no way to recycle them. Also photo-voltaic installations need to be manufactured industrially and are in need of regular replacement.

The new energy is not really fit for purpose for many reasons, as yet unsolvable problems exist regarding sufficient energy storage and their reliance on weather patterns. Furthermore, from an ecological perspective, water-based power plants are far from being problem-free, and biomass – such as rapeseed and palm-oil – are affecting an alternative land use, such as a possible organic food production.

That is why other countries – except Germany and Austria – continue to use nuclear energy, reasoning that it is also "green" and "clean", i.e. "CO₂-neutral". This, of course, is not true. One must take into consideration the mining of uranium, not to mention the renewability and the anticipated "sustainability" issues with this form of energy, depending on a decreasing amount of available uranium. Furthermore, there is the insurmountable and permanent problem of radioactive waste disposal, on a global scale.

Nuclear energy obviously seems indispensable. It was invented by the military and in this context, continues to be in need for various weapon systems and the operation of military "geo-engineering" installations, such as the "ionosphere heater", which is another technological invention of the new form of progress – rarely discussed – as part of the so-called "4th industrial revolution" (Bertell; Werlhof 2021).

This is already an indication of what the new progress is supposed to look like. Contrary to the previous form of progress, the new one is untruly presented as "green" and sustainable.

After the alleged acknowledgement of the problem of destruction, it is now not at all about introducing non-damaging ways of production. So, the drastic reduction of the consumption amount of resources and nature is indeed intended. Otherwise, the current rate of consumption would soon reach its absolute limits, leaving nothing for later times and the elites.

At the same time there is a new progress announced. For this to take place, however, the new technologies would need a gigantically increased energy supply. Thus, the new progress far exceeds the questionable CO₂-reduction and the currently available energy sources as well as dubious renewable energy sources.

This progress is the one of the so-called "4th industrial revolution" and is intended to reach an even more esteemed reputation than its predecessor.

This way, the successor model of progress vastly surpasses the previous model, not only in energy consumption but also regarding the required machinery.

The 4th industrial revolution is designed to overcome, first and foremost, the hitherto industrial revolutions by dispensing them from the necessity to use a huge amount of human beings as a living labor force. However, this does not mean that human beings will now be liberated from work.

Rather, at the core, this new model of industrial revolution is based on the intention to integrate the still required labor force directly into the machinery. The aim is to transform them in such ways that they become parts of the machine, also by way of feeding their organic, biological force as "renewable, green" energy into the machine. Apart from that, the idea is to transform them into controllable robots.

This is to take place via a "convergence-technological" combination of biotechnology (genetic engineering and synthetic biology), artificial intelligence, AI, and nano-technology which also allow for "mind-control" (Werlhof 2020), i.e. the control of thinking, feeling and behavior of „transhumans“ who would be directly connected to a global AI-cloud.

All this is to be complemented via geo-engineering technologies by the military (Werlhof 2021).

Furthermore, all these technologies can serve and make sure that narratives such as climate change and multiple pandemics can be confirmed time and again. It is now possible to technologically "deliver" the necessary facts for such crises. Within such a planetary mega-machine of the new system of progress, a human being, if still in existence by then, would de facto cease to exist as a free agent and as a living individual (Werlhof, forthcoming 2022).

Victim of the new progress – the human race itself?

The transformation of human beings from being users of machines into patentable, trans-, and even posthuman parts of a superimposed machinery, i.e. human beings used by the machine, lies ahead of us. It now takes the form of the digital mega-machine, currently in development, called the "internet of things", IoT. Humans integrated into the machine in this way, would no longer be considered living beings with their own rights, but rather be defined as patents, i.e. "things", or "information", usually belonging to a company. This "thing" by then has become the property of others, much like a slave in previous times, and

because of this status, is no longer allowed to have property of its own.

This is what the so-called circular economy of the "Great Reset" i.e. the "Green New Deal" is designed for.

Thus, today's "green revolution" as a new world order no longer recognizes the homo sapiens, the individual, the owner, the proprietor, or any otherwise independent and free human being – except those on the very top. It would be the utmost of a "technocratic dictatorship" that is now becoming blatantly clear.

However, 7-8 billion people are not needed for such a transhumanism. This form of "de-growth" only works via de-population, as a new form of eugenics, even euthanasia. The new progress of mankind now turns directly against mankind itself – it is a complete reversal of the perspective on humanity.

It is this very reversal that is not comprehended, because progress is always supposed to be in the service of the good. That is why no alternative is considered. There is a compulsion to always apply progress in its latest development. So, no "why"-question is asked about the fact that progress demands ever higher sacrifices.

For instance, the remaining "new human" preferably would no longer be born of a mother in the hitherto sense of *conditio humana*, but rather become a product of industrial human-, and chimera-manufacturing. Genetic engineering, synthetic biology and nano-technology as well as AI are already working on the process of incrementally unhinging human beings from nature and creating all kinds of mixed "life" forms.

Until then, the new no-longer-human could be produced via an increasing "merging" of him/it, inwardly and outwardly, with the particular machinery (Kurzweil; Schwab). In the meantime, the IoT with which humans are to be merged, is already praised as the greatest progress of all times.

This very "progress" is considered the alleged "evolution" created by and belonging to, "a better, higher, all powerful", but no longer human "homo deus" within the "god-machine" (Harari).

Indeed, "man-made" problems beyond the elite and its system, would thus no longer in need of being feared. Progress, in such a complete reversal of perspective, is to become ever more our belief system and our religion. In such a scenario, "why-questions" are altogether superfluous – possibly for ever.

Today's crisis is a topic that is defined from above. Not only is it laid out in deceptive ways, it is also offering incorrect answers. The opportunity is not taken to create a civilization capable of "affording" human beings, because of their ability to create life – i.e. to live and to produce without destruction. Such a human being would still be the "wellspring of abundance", in the understanding of Karl Marx. For this once existed and continues to still exist, here and there.

But this is not referred to here, even though the terms "green", "sustainable" or "basic income" as a prospect suggest a connection with former social movements that had expressed a critique of progress from "below" rather than from above.

Because a truly nature-oriented and egalitarian society would surely not be a machine-

oriented one with high-energy consumption and thus not considered to be "progressive". Such a society would rather be a "return" to – or a new advancement to the well-known methods of non-interfering and non-damaging interaction with the earth, in which nobody would generate profit, or achieve any form of power.

Most of all one would not fulfill the alleged human task of establishing a civilization which is to pursue a constant higher and better development, including the subsequent vanishing of humans from the earth altogether, according to the motto: mission accomplished – humans obsolete?!

So far, there is no uprising in sight against the new and shocking plan of making homo sapiens disappear from the earth, a project that is not even concealed (e.g. Kurzweil; Schwab), as the common belief in progress being per se for the good is so powerful everywhere.

One continues to believe in progress, even if life is at stake now – be it life itself, or the autonomous life of a still free human being. It seems that most people have not yet understood what today's crisis is all about. It is about themselves, or more precisely: it is about a development directed against themselves!

A critique of progressive technologies remains chronically underexposed and, for reasons already outlined above, also unchallenged, because there is a belief in these technologies much like in a fetish. Nothing less than a technological world revolution in favor of man is expected from them.

Men, especially, always identified with the technology of the machine even to the point of "a mimetic approximation"(Genth), and in their fascination bowed down to them in "promethean shame" (Anders).

Hence, an "apocalypse-blindness" (Anders) reigns, which does not allow for the current developments to be experienced as an unveiling or even as a revelation on the actual truth of this civilization. The consciousness of most people has not yet entered the dehumanized, mere machine-logic dimension (Genth) within which technological progress is moving today. In 2008, shortly before his death, Joseph Weizenbaum, a most intimate connoisseur of the 4th industrial revolution declared at a meeting of the WEF in Davos:

"When the 4th industrial revolution is being realized, the living will envy the dead!"

As a scientist who has taught and done research for decades at the hereon specialized, famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, in Boston, in the area of expert-systems, i.e. artificial intelligence systems, knew what he was talking about. Contrary to most of his colleagues, he was a critical thinker who did not become corrupted or blinded. He raised his voice in warning (Weizenbaum).

Furthermore, he clarified that in the case of the new industrial revolution the quality of progress as the alleged generator of a "better" world does not apply, particularly and notably, not for human beings.

So, how if progress so far has not only damaged nature, but generally did not produce anything better than nature? And what if now the same development would take place with respect to humans?

On the historical deep structure of progress and human sacrifice

Are 500 years sufficient in calling forth and strengthening an unquestionable belief like the one in progress, even under continuously adverse conditions and exorbitant sacrifices, including human sacrifices, which so far have always been an integral part of it ever since its implementation?

Are the developments during the last centuries sufficient in explaining that people today seem to be ready to offer themselves voluntarily in the name of progress – i.e. to sacrifice their very lives or their lives as human beings in the hitherto existing understanding?

Are we approaching a large human sacrifice, whose ritualization is already heralded, considering the propaganda for massive Covid-19 genetic therapy, called „vaccination“ and the beginning diffamation of the unvaccinated, called the "non solidary ones"? In the summer of 2021, this was still about 40% of the population in Central Europe.

Are we approaching the sacrifice of the lives of people, even the lives of their children, the worst possible sacrifice of all – or will it finally come to a revolt?

It is no coincidence that the moderne era is almost always presented as a civilization sui generis, rarely having roots in a past – except for a few references to antiquity. The modern era does not seem to have a historical depth-dimension. In this way, the view of its old historical roots and what these consist of is obscured.

Issues like a "creation out of destruction", the alleged "improvement" of nature, of life, of matter and of humans, even their "higher re-creation", a characteristic feature of the modern era, are ideas, utopias, plans and experiments that are not limited to the current time. On the contrary, these issues have a history of several 1000's of years, even though initially, these have not been defined as "progress".

One could not talk about progress as long as it remained in the imagination and was not able to be put into practice and as long as these attempts kept unsuccessful. Respective experiments have been conducted for a long time, mostly without success.

"Alchemy" as the method of progress – the utopia of a re-creation of the world via its destruction

The name of these experiments was "alchemy" (Schütt) and this continues to be the name, even though it is nearly nowhere admitted nor identified as such!

This is my hypothesis which I have investigated from a historical perspective and documented in great detail in a comprehensive body of work (Werlhof, forthcoming, 2022). It shows that the supposedly improved neo-creation of the world is a much older project. It is surrounded by an ideology that has shaped humanity for thousands of years and it is one we know since our earliest days. It is also tied to a belief system that is disseminated continuously. Recently, it is propagated with increased intensity.

Initially, the only thing missing was a general, success-promising practice.

Alchemy, pursuing this aim, failed time and again. Only in the modern era has progress as alchemy gained a systematic gestalt and became more successful.

The failure of alchemy as a method is related to the fact that it abandoned its predecessor, an alchemy of a much older source – in translation – alchemy as the „black mud“ from the river Nile, „land of the moon“, the „flow of the Goddess“.

For this older form of alchemy stems from a culture and civilization that essentially honored and imitated the process of nature – in this case the cyclical flooding of the Nile and its effects on the fecundity of the soil on its banks. Such was the custom in all early garden and agricultural communities.

Much later a "new" form of alchemy was invented, that did not observe nature's processes, but instead was interested in overcoming nature, desiring to create something entirely new: a neo-creation. This intent was unsuccessful because nature's process is not meant to be overcome. Later success in the practice of alchemy, which we can observe in modern times, can eventually only be of temporary nature and not be of lasting value.

This in fact is the key question of today:

Did alchemy achieve its final break-through in the modern era or is it approaching its final failure?

To begin with: if one compares the failed alchemical method with today's progress, then the latter one means:

Progress is the alchemical transformation of the original state of the world into something which is precisely not its natural state, but considered as being better, higher and closer even to god's desire. It is represented as something that nature itself was allegedly dreaming of ever since.

- The belief in progress is the alchemical belief in miracles, in a literal overthrowing of nature's inherent order, anticipating its complete neo-creation, produced by man, preferably in random ways: it is deemed to be better and good, even god's desire and anticipated by nature itself.
- From an alchemical perspective, the meaning of progress as a form of religion, ideology and utopian project is grounded in the belief that progress is supposedly the *raison d'être* of man on earth.
- Progress is the "sacred cow" especially of our times, as it is only now becoming a reality after alchemical experimenting of 500 years. It is supposed to be the realization of an old dream of mankind as well as seemingly the dream of nature itself. That is why it is sacro-sanct. Hence, critiquing progress appears as a kind of *lèse-majesty*!

Alchemical transformation of the world precisely means: transformation of matter, of the living and all of nature to the point of transforming the earth as a planet and even human beings themselves.

The object to be transformed becomes dissected first, then is assembled with new kinds of material and finally is turned into "machine". The machine appears as the respective better and higher, as the "2.", now truly successful creation and "nature". By comparison, god as the alchemical father and „creator“ allegedly was not good enough, yet.

The "improvement of man" or the creation of a "new human being" was already undertaken

in previous times, e.g. via specific measures in cloisters, dungeons and educational institutions, in factories, in the military, in the field of medicine and in psychotherapy.

After millenia alchemists are now at the point of attempting to substitute the very body of a human being, i.e. no longer being born (in a natural way) from the body of a mother. Thus, they are changing the very *conditio humana*. So far, experiments were limited to the homunculus: the first attempts of breeding a human being outside the body of a mother, i.e. in retort, have remained unsuccessful for millenia.

The now anticipated, literal "manufacturing of (human) beings" in an industrial sense is supposed to be the crown of creation, the neo-creation of humans by humans, or rather by man and his machinery – and precisely not by woman, or a mother. In this way, humans would become allegedly better and higher forms of beings, even though – or precisely, because – s/he would no longer be a natural, free and sovereign human being.

Actually, as a "machine-being" s/he is intended to be more "godly". In that case the new god no longer requires women as mater-ial mothers; and the "father" would appear in the form of the universal "god-machine". Overall, this is a utopian, planetary mega-project and its realization is intended to be implemented gradually. In its course the entire world would literally be turned upside down, taken apart and put together in new and completely different ways, largely independent of nature's inherent order, evolution, and boundaries. The random composition of its parts would then be propagated as a "higher" neo-creation – even though the exact opposite would be true.

In alchemy, essential terms for this process include:

1. "mortification", deriving from *mors*, death, i.e. the taking apart of/killing of living matter,
2. the "Opus Magnum" as the result of the new composition of what was mortified, beyond the original, natural appearance, becoming a new and considered a "higher" form of matter (originally gold), or rather, a "higher form of life" (machine),
3. "the philosopher's stone", a kind of formula/technique/essence/substance/idea which is to render possible the Opus Magnum everywhere and at all times.

It is about nothing less than the utopian creation of a new world and a new order, which is directed against the current one. The intention is to gradually substitute the latter one by a kind of counter-, or anti-nature-order. This then is propagated as a better and higher "order of nature", allegedly intended by nature itself, as nature presumably feels imperfect itself. In order to document this claim, the results of alchemy are called "2. Nature", even though the neo-creation is precisely intended to no longer be nature in its original sense. But it has to be pretended that everything emerging from alchemy is „natural“.

The contradiction of this entire endeavour lies in the treatment of the world and a course of action based on "destruction as method". Naturally, the total result in the end cannot produce a "more" and a "better". If at all, the latter one can only be of a temporary nature.

What is the source of such a monstrous utopia, this concrete project which since centuries, keeps the world in suspension with its actions, thoughts and intentions, and in a breathless dynamic of constant change?

In its process it has already transformed and damaged the world to a large extent. For

without destruction – mortification – of the world there can be no new one. Hence, those who want a different world will have to sacrifice the existing one.

This is the reason for the continuous destruction of the world, which is reigned by alchemists, approaching essentially the final "Omnicide", the destruction of everything, while there is a co-existing belief of witnessing the alleged emergence of a completely new and better world.

That way, the phenomenon of a "nuclear alchemy" is celebrating even the atomic mortification as the ultimate creation of a new life, while existing life turns to ashes (Wagner).

On this monstrous path we are on, and we shall soon find out how long original nature will go along with all this. We shall experience whether people, being blind to this apocalypse, are willing to sacrifice themselves, too, in order to become "improved", or whether they will finally rise up in protest instead.

At the core – pater arché instead of mater arché – patriarchy as a civilization of "fathers" instead of mothers

The entire endeavour remains incomprehensible unless the core theme is identified, i.e. the key issue from the onset seems to be locked up in the collective unconscious. The neo-creation shall no longer be natural and born from a mother, as it is generally common – a "mater arché", to have a mother as the original source of new life. Arché initially means origin, beginning and womb (arché as domination only came about with patriarchy). Nature itself is primarily organized in feminine-motherly-creative ways and women are by nature, much like her, i.e. they are, as it were, nature in its human dimension.

In the alchemical project, nature is to be transformed from a feminine into a "masculine" one – in the sense of a patriarchal nature, bringing forth a "fatherly" neo-creation, instead of a motherly one – a pater arché instead of mater arché. (in more detail in Werlhof, forthcoming 2022)

That is the reason why, since then, all "science" on behalf of the patriarchal system can never be viewed as being "neutral", merely "rational" and allegedly "not normative" (see Kaiser interview in the movie) – as it were, in the sense of common reason. This was and is merely its claim and self-justification. The truth is, it has always been about the realization of the self-fulfilling prophecy of a world of the fathers against the world of the mothers, which is why it cannot be called a "neutral" and reasonable project. At some point, however, the discussion of this issue was stopped, namely since modern times. Instead, this project became the unquestioned or unjustifiable cause of a general sine qua non for one's own acting, thinking, feeling and desiring – i.e. it became part of the collective unconscious.

It is not helpful to embed the resulting technology in an appropriate philosophy (see text of movie) when this philosophy does not identify the patriarchal preconditions of its origins, not questioning its own foundation. Such an attempt is unsuitable for a (proper) contextualization.

Already in ancient Egypt, the pharaoh Echnaton had himself depicted as a pregnant man and adopted the name of the former original and all powerful goddess Nut/nouth – via a (sly) reversal of the syllables (!). The aspiration is clear. In this way, the first monotheistic,

patriarchal religion, the Aton religion, was founded. From then on, God became the opposite of the Goddess. He became the creator of life, not her. From then on the "pater arché" was valid.

The neo-creation is to be "born of the fathers", man-made, without nature's creation, an invention beyond nature, an anti-, and counter-nature, an alleged "2. nature" – allegedly desired even by nature itself. It would be the fulfillment of its own dream, perfected and redeemed from the mother through the pater arché, the fatherly creator.

Likewise, well-nigh, the alchemical mesopotamian creation myth Enuma Elish, which depicts the fight of Marduk against his mother, the all powerful Ur-goddess – "chaos" – Tiamat. He kills her and from the parts of her dead body he forms the new nature, which he dominates, creating the new order of the "cosmos".

This is the key issue at the root of it all, ever since the foundation of patriarchal civilizations. It remains the central theme to this very day. Neo-creation after destruction of the original creation is the utmost goal, to be achieved in everything and everywhere, on a global scale. For a new world, created by the self-proclaimed "fathers" as opposed to the one of the mothers and by mother nature, would prove the existence and justification of a patriarchal world, a civilization and a new "nature", according to the conceptions of those fathers. It would represent their permanent legitimization.

The success of such a project would furthermore be the final prove of the alleged existence of god, who incarnates himself even in human earthly form, i.e. in the "fathers" and who, in the end, would have found his final gestalt in a god-machine, allegedly representing nothing less than the creation of the universe itself.

In this way, the hubris of patriarchy turns into a mere joke in the end, a joke into which the entire world is now about to be forced to believe in.

Today, we have a definition of patriarchy that allows us to understand what is taking place, what has taken place and what is supposed to happen in the future, as long as the patriarchal civilization exists. This definition far exceeds the regular term of patriarchy as a mere form of domination, which is only a political term. It is about far more than that, namely the concrete technical transformation of the world, to the point where one does no longer need to dominate it, because it has become the way one always wanted to have the world.

From a patriarchal perspective, domination is only necessary as long as the world is still in its primary, original nature, or in one of its corresponding culture. The ideal patriarchal condition however, would be one in which domination is obsolete. "It does what we want" said Craig Venter, inventor of synthetic biology, in reference to a bacteria he created in order to describe what the new "life" is supposed to be. From a patriarchal-alchemical perspective, the better and higher life form is one which is no longer an independent life, and hence is no longer in need of being "dominated". Ideally, it has its source in the patriarchal system itself and as a pater-arché-product it is apriori perfectly fitted for patriarchy – like the machine. Likewise, the machine's purpose is to do "what we want".

Patriarchy as an "alchemical war system" against humanity and nature: the Why of it all!

After the invention of the machine during the 18th century, the 4th industrial revolution

represents the realization of the alchemical-patriarchal dream per se.

This revolution is based on a "total" alchemy in the form of segmentation of all matter and non - matter, down to its finest molecular/atomic structures and is supposed to bring forth completely new compositions, neo-creations and inventions of the world and all its creatures, by way of pushing beyond the evolutionary boundaries, previous forms and inherent order.

Its inventors are in an actual state of intoxication and delusion. Now everything seems to be possible. Not only is now apparently proven that God as a creator does exist, but he is among us, and I, the creator of new life, am God. The 2. creation, the new Genesis, is on its way (see Preston). It is about finalizing the complete implementation of patriarchy as the ultimate "alchemical war system" against all of life, i.e. human and other beings, nature and the earth itself.

Our in essence simple, yet comprehensive definition of patriarchy, which is applicable in complex contexts and able to convert all reversals, has led to the new, pre-disciplinary approach of "Critical Theory of Patriarchy" (Werlhof forthcoming, 2022).

Patriarchy as explanation came about because the "why-question" was asked, time and again, and in expansive ways. The "why-question" was leading to the identification of patriarchy. Perhaps this is the reason why this question is not asked, in order to avoid this very answer.

However, our movie abstained from such a definition of patriarchy. Hence, the following addendum.

Not until this perspective is considered, one can comprehend:

Why is there so much destruction by the "fathers" against the mothers and mother nature? Without it, there would be no opportunity for a neo-creation by the "fathers".

Why is the element of the living in science not considered? Because after its destruction, the scientists want to neo-created it and present it as "father-made", as the allegedly better and higher and even godly "life".

Why is a human being in patriarchy, on the one hand conceived of as a nothing and on the other hand as God? Because being born of a mother is considered to be lower and not perfect, essentially "unworthy". Only being manufactured/"born" by a "father" accounts for a "higher" value, even a godly one.

Why does the belief in progress exist, to the point of being a progress-religion? Because it promises to create a new and better world via neo-creation by the fathers. The world of the mother is considered imperfect and to be of low value.

Why is there no moment of pause (for reflection), why do change and destruction continue? Because everything, according to this patriarchal way of thinking, requires a neo-creation and therefore needs to be destroyed first.

Why has this patriarchal endeavour become a veritable world-war against life, women and mothers, against original nature, and is now even turning against human beings as such themselves? Because all are supposed to vanish, be annihilated and/or be turned into their

very opposite – the neo-creation.

Why are the inherent dangers of such a project not identified? Because, in a complete reversal of things, the moment of pause and maintaining nature's given ways themselves are seen as the danger!

What is the meaning of the machine as a patriarchal technique? It is the epitome of the alchemical bringing forth of a "better" life, without a living body, without women and mothers, without a gender and a motherly genealogy and without the original natural occurrence of childbirth. The machine represents the ideal of a machine-body, and the natural living body is to be transformed and replaced by it.

Why does science not admit that they are operating from a wrong premise, from a wrong definition of nature? Because they want to destroy – mortify – living nature and substitute it, pursuing a self-fulfilling prophecy, proving they were right by saying all matter is dead matter and life is created from dead matter – with their leading premise of death coming first before there was life.

Why is natural science not "dumb" when it comes to life? Because it is intentionally committing a crime against life itself and tries to deny this fact.

- If destruction – mortification – is "necessary", it is logically impossible that in the long run more and something better will emerge.
- Instead, systemic destruction is rampant – up to the point where everything will vanish and the "Omnicide" appears as „Nothingness“.

The "top" admits to this by pulling the emergency brake on progress in its current form and by ruthless decimation of its participants, while the idea of progress itself is not given up.

In this way, the problem is only deferred, resulting in ever more destructive forms.

Why is patriarchy and its method, patriarchal alchemy, not abolished?

Because it is collectively unconscious and – as a form of religion – it is a taboo. Even though it is applied with increasing and intentional implementation on an always larger scale, it is not supposed to be identified for what it really is – the destruction of the world, rather than its so-called neo-creation. Abandoning patriarchal alchemy would be equivalent to dismantling patriarchy.

How did the human tragedy, as a result of this, begin? When was this development initiated and when did the fatality start? It began with patriarchy a few thousand years ago. In modern times, it gained steadily momentum with its alchemical development dynamics, reaching a culmination point today.

- Why is it so difficult to identify patriarchy? Because then, what was once believed to be true and right, in almost all aspects of life, would need to be questioned as well as everything that was thought, felt, done and desired.
- It would culminate in the enormous question of guilt in the face of the destruction of the world and the killing of the living. It would most likely lead to a comprehensive, socio-somatic as well as psychic-spiritual breakdown of the modern era as civilization of patriarchy (see Renggli 1992).

The Answer – The revolt of life and the people!?

After answering the "why"- question on the destruction, there could be a spiritual revolt of unknown dimensions. The beginning sacrifice of human life as such could and would instead be followed by a revolt of life and of the people!

A sense of how this might announce itself was palpable during a concert performance of Puccini's opera *Tosca* in Graz, Austria, on August 8, 2021. In his famous aria, Mario, the lover of Tosca, sang these words towards the end of the first stanza, "...and I never loved as much as I do now – THIS LIFE!" – LA VITA!

At this moment, long before the end of this aria, in the middle of the song there was a sudden outburst among the audience, and for a few minutes the singer, Jonas Kaufmann, the orchestra, the conductor, everybody had to pause.

There was an uproar, calling, clapping, screaming, crying and cheering, as if LIFE itself just found its riverbed in the audience, as if streaming from the depths of their souls into the trembling hearts, hands, eyes, voices and bodies, breaking through... wild and boisterously and full of irrepressible desire, joy, power and certainty!

It was a moment of collective shake-up, LIFE had shown its force. It does not want to be sacrificed. A premonition of this sacrifice is already in the air, but LIFE wants to LIVE!

What LIFE really means has to enter people's consciousness now and not only stream spontaneously through their hearts like in this moment at the opera, only to ebb away again.

The answer to the "why-question", i.e. why progress knows no limits and is systemically destructive, needs to be addressed and is urgent like never before.

For today the moment of truth has come. In unfathomable ways, those "above" have already begun to downright relinquish LIFE, to sacrifice humans, if not humanity and even the children, in the name of progress and according to the intentions of its patriarchal protagonists. The "mortification" of human beings as their transformation into "no longer-human-beings" within the "Opus Magnum " has already begun on a global scale, too.

Could this have been it? Are these indeed "the last days of mankind"?

One hundred years after Karl Krauss, this topic is coming up again, and now even for almost everyone, for "mankind". Why and how could it come to such a situation? Already in 1986, after the nuclear accident – the MCA , the maximum credible accident – of Chernobyl we, the mothers, appealed in protest "We will not sacrifice our children to progress!" (Werlhof 1986).

And now it has come thus far, in fact on the entire planet? (see Chossudovsky)

Culmination or the End of patriarchy?

The question today is about the provisional end of a long history – the history of patriarchy. It consisted of building a world, that is less mother-, human-, and nature- oriented, consisting instead of destruction, transformation and substitution of mothers, humans and nature – deemed to be "capital" (Werlhof 2012). This project was performed with humans, and humans essentially participated in it, either voluntarily or by force. In this respect, patriarchy is truly "man-made", most of all, "elite-made". It has been extended into a

comprehensive system of so-called civilization.

This historical process of a massive "reversal" of everything (Werlhof 2011) is not being understood to this very day, not to mention, being regretted or put on hold. Things cannot continue in this way. In the face of all this destruction, the earth has reached its limits. Likewise to nature and non-patriarchal cultures, all human beings not yet transformed or not able to be turned into "capital" are now supposed to give way to patriarchy. In the end, its ruthless, brutal project can only be sustained for a minority of people, due to its destructive nature – unless it is given up. From the perspective of patriarchy, such an idea certainly is not an option (Werlhof 2010).

In the meantime, capitalism has done its part, by mobilising the masses via free enterprise economy into plundering and transforming the world. In socialism this was accomplished via command-economy of the state. Today, this is no longer necessary. On the contrary, it has long become counterproductive for the system, because the consumption of resources, given their finiteness, has become too comprehensive.

Furthermore, in the meantime the system has build up capital in the form of a machinery that no longer requires masses of people, like before.

Similarly to the entrepreneur and the laborer, now even the "housewife" who was previously in wide demand, is now abraded, in order to diminish or even stop the reproduction of the species (Werlhof 2019).

The system thus transforms itself into a technocracy (see Wood), or rather into one that "substitutes" nature and society with the mega-machine which makes and distributes its profits no longer in the common form, so far used in the Western world. In the East, these practices had already been different. After all, money can be printed, or rather be "dished-out" in different forms. This is what is already happening and what has been in the planning for a long time (see Wolff).

In this process, the criterion has shifted, from human beings to the machine, their "higher" substitute as the alleged "better life". That is how its "fathers" attempt to fulfill their delusion of a complete neo-creation of the world. Will they succeed? What kind of problems will such a transition entail? The key players, e.g. the WEF and UN estimate a period of approximately 10-30 years. By then the last rebels will have passed away, that is, if there are no new ones. That is why nowadays children are targeted, becoming more and more the focal point of the „measures“. Then follows the industrial „creation“ of the human-machine-being still needed. Such seems to be the plan.

In this way, the genuine patriarchal „hate of LIFE“ and of living human beings finally is revealed. Patriarchy no longer wants to tolerate free human beings who are original, surprising, loving, funny, always different, wonderful, clever, graceful, independent, resistant and act with self-authority. For it views humans born by a mother essentially as "deficient beings", as evil, low, imperfect and as a permanent "risk-factor", in need of being transformed into something supposedly higher, better, according to god, through an alleged fatherly neo-creation. Initially this applied particularly to women as mothers, who were always suitably tormented – but they were still needed. Now, this applies to everyone:

Matricide is on the verge of becoming now global mass-murder!

In time, most people believed in patriarchy and participated in its politics. Recently, also increasing numbers of women, who were made to believe that the category of "sex" or gender would be dropped, by overcoming nature through progress. Thus they would be liberated from patriarchy, in the understanding of being a system to simply mean the domination by men. In reality, however, it is about robbing women of their creative abilities and integrating them into the gender-neutral machinery.

Most human beings no longer know anything different than progress of patriarchy. Patriarchy is "man-made" insofar as people have increasingly handed over their responsibility to the ones "above" – or rather, to the machine. Should this behaviour continue, it will become their suicide. They are literally falling prey to their own system – its reversal of everything. Now they will have to recognize this very fact and make a choice.

Do they really want to be "born of fathers" and become cyborgs, allowing the sacrifice of living bodies, no longer born of a mother, to happen – in the same way they allowed the body of nature to be sacrificed? Do they really want to perform an alleged service to the "grand plan" and contribute with their very lives to progress, thus "bidding farewell to the concept of man being a part of nature", as recommended from above? (Schwab)

Or, will they finally ask the "why-question" – in order to receive the feared and long postponed, but saving answer? Do they want to be saved and will they save nature as well? Or will they continue to abandon nature? Will they, thereupon, finally want to abandon patriarchy and carry this out? (see Projektgruppe)

Patriarchy is the historical deep structure of the modern era as "capitalist patriarchy", the "higher-order" civilization, which imposed itself by means of violence and war on the old world civilization of matriarchy, understood as the order of mater arché. In this process, patriarchy gradually annihilated the previous order almost everywhere.

The inherent life affirming, egalitarian, non-dominating and nature-honoring motherly order and wisdom, which can still be experienced in the living matriarchies of today (Göttner-Abendroth/Derungs) was followed by its exact opposite. Our definition of patriarchy explains why, where, when and how this took place (Werlhof forthcoming 2022).

In the movie, barely any of these issues were explained; its intentions were different. The mention of the term patriarchy alone is not sufficient to comprehend why and how the system of patriarchy is the key to arriving at a true understanding of our times.

The moment of truth

This moment of truth decides who will survive the current demolition of the modern era and, if so, for what purpose. What is at stake, by penalty of one's own downfall, is to at last understand patriarchy, to abandon this system and to rebuild a nature-honoring civilization.

Saying no is not enough and illusions are counterproductive, as these prevent the recognition of the key issue and a right course of action. One has to really think our current situation all the way through and consider where we are now, and why, what we each have contributed to the situation, leastway by not having prevented it.

Hope would come from the certitude of finally being on the right path. How this is to take place on a political level is unclear, as the means to do so are not in reach, or in decline. On a spiritual level, this would first of all require reparations towards the earth, mother nature

and the natural state of humanity.

The purpose of the moment of truth is to eventually arrive at an understanding of patriarchy. This requires a considerable leap of consciousness. Otherwise there will be no corresponding action, feeling and volition. So far, hardly anyone knows why all this happened and is happening. Hardly anyone even wants to know.

The "why-question" inevitably leads to patriarchy and one would see that almost everyone participated, either voluntarily or out of necessity. This recognition of course had to be prevented. The question of guilt can only be answered by admitting to it, to know its origins, and to immediately stop contributing to it.

The evidence of the existence of patriarchy and the explanatory power of our different definition of patriarchy are resounding. What actually cannot be explained by it?

Patriarchy is the common blockhead that hides in the collective unconscious.

People will take away this blockhead and will be able to see – what a liberation this would be! It will open the door for a revolt of life and of the people...

As with a thirsty person in the desert, the current destitution and threat evoke the memory of the body, the mind and the soul, of LIFE itself. For a long time, their plethora and powers have been betrayed, destroyed, lost, and forgotten.

Today's first and foremost call is this:

"I will affirm and honor the sacredness of life in myself.

Since eons of time, life is present in every cell of my body.

The body is the place where all that is essential is united.

The body has its own wisdom and I trust it.

I want to become aware of this life, this body and the great source of joy they bring me.
I want to honor and appreciate this gift.

I will never render the responsibility for my life, my body, my spirit and my soul to anyone else.

I shall defend body and life wherever they are devalued or threatened.

I shall disapprove with every fiber of my being the abandonment or even sacrifice of my body and my life.

This is the marrow of what I can do in this moment, for myself, for all my loved ones and all others.

I shall commit to this".

This is only the beginning, all else will follow from it.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Dr. Claudia von Werlhof is Prof. Emerita of Political Science and Women's Studies at the University of Innsbruck in Austria. She is the author of many books and has worked hard to make Rosalie Bertell's important book Planet Earth: The Latest Weapon of War on Geoengineering available in German, Spanish, Italian, French and English again. Claudia was the founder of the Planetary Movement for Mother Earth (PMME) in 2010.

She is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG).

Sources

Anders, Günther, 1980: Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen, 2 Bde. München, Beck

Bertell, Rosalie, 2020: Kriegswaffe Planet Erde, 5. Auflage, Gelnhausen, J.K. Fischer

Bhakdi, Sucharit mit Karina Reiß, 2020: [Corona Fehllalarm? Zahlen, Daten und Hintergründe](#), Berlin / Wien, Goldegg Verlag

Carson, Rachel, 1962: Der stumme Frühling, München, Beck

Chossudovsky, Michel, 2021: The "Killer Vaccine" Worldwide. 7.9 Billion People. The Covid-19 Vaccine should be Halted and Discontinued Immediately Worldwide, Global Research, August 27

Ehrlich, Paul, 1973: Die Bevölkerungsbombe, Frankfurt a.M., Fischer

Genth, Renate, 2002: Über Maschinisierung und Mimesis, Frankfurt, Peter Lang, www.globalresearch.at, laufend seit 2020

Göttner-Abendroth, Heide und Derungs, Kurt (Hg.), 1997: Matriarchate als herrschaftsfreie Gesellschaften, Bern, Amalia

Harari, Yuval, 2017: Homo Deus. Eine Geschichte von morgen, München, Beck

Jaeger, Michael, 2015: Wanderers Verstummen. Goethes Schweigen. Fausts Tragödie. Oder: Die große Transformation der Welt, Würzburg, Königshausen & Neumann

Kurzweil, Ray, 2016: Die Intelligenz der Evolution. Wenn Mensch und Computer verschmelzen, Köln, Kiepenheuer & Witsch

Matters, Ryan, 2021: mRNA "Vaccines", Eugenics & the Push for Transhumanism. <https://offguardian.org/2021/08/28/mrna-vaccines-eugenics-the-push-for-transhumanism/>

PBME, Planetare Bewegung für Mutter Erde, 2019: Greta und die große Ver(w)irrung. 2. Offener Brief an Greta Thunberg, www.pbme-online.org, Oktober 2019

<http://www.pbme-online.org/2019/10/01/greta-und-die-grosse-verwirrung-2-offener-brief-an-greta-thunberg/>

Preston, Christopher, 2018: Sind wir noch zu retten? Wie wir mit neuen Technologien die

Natur verändern können, Berlin Springer

Projektgruppe „Zivilisationspolitik“ (Hg.) 2009: Aufbruch aus dem Patriarchat – Wege in eine neue Zivilisation? Frankfurt a.M., Peter Lang

_____ 2011: Kann es eine ´neue Erde´ geben? Zur Kritischen Patriarchatstheorie und der Praxis einer post- patriarchalen Zivilisation, Beiträge zur Dissidenz, Nr. 28, Frankfurt a.M., Peter Lang

Renggli, Franz, 1992: Selbstzerstörung aus Verlassenheit, Hamburg, Rasch & Röhring

Rifkin, Jeremy, 2019: Der Globale Green New Deal, Frankfurt a.M., Campus

Ripple, William et al, 2021: World Scientists' Warning of a Climate Emergency 2021, in BioScience, Vol. 71, Issue 9, September 2021, pp 894-898
<https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biab079>

Schütt, Hans Werner, 2000: Auf der Suche nach dem Stein der Weisen. Die Geschichte der Alchemie, München, Beck

Schwab, Klaus und Malleret, Thierry, 2020: Covid-19. The Great Reset, Davos, WEF

Severino, Emmanuele, 1983: Vom Wesen des Nihilismus, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta

Sorgner, Stefan Lorenz, 2018: Schöner neuer Mensch, Berlin, Nicolai publishing

Wagner, Friedrich, 1970: Weg und Abweg der Naturwissenschaft, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta

Weizenbaum, Joseph, 1989: Die Macht der Computer und die Ohnmacht der Vernunft, Frankfurt a.M., Suhrkamp

Werlhof, Claudia von et al. 1983: Frauen, die letzte Kolonie, Reinbek, Rowohlt

_____ 1986: Wir werden das Leben unserer Kinder nicht dem Fortschritt opfern! in Gambaroff, Marina et al.: Tschernobyl hat unser Leben verändert. Vom Ausstieg der Frauen, Reinbek, Rowohlt, S. 8-24

_____ 2010: West-End, Das Scheitern der Moderne als „kapitalistisches Patriarchat“ und die Logik der Alternativen, Köln, PapyRossa

_____ 2011: Die Verkehrung. Das Projekt des Patriarchats und das Gender-Dilemma, Wien, Promedia

_____ 2012: Der unerkannte Kern der Krise. Die Moderne als Er-Schöpfung der Welt. Zur Alchemie des Patriarchats, Uhlstädt-Kirchhasel, Arun

_____ 2020: Die Große Transformation. Zwangsgeimpft – und kein Mensch mehr? in: Raum&Zeit, Nr. 229, 28.12.2020, S. 64-69; in English:
<https://www.nogeoingegneria.com/news-eng/compulsory-vaccination-that-genetically-alters-the-human-body-no-longer-a-human-being/>

_____ 2019: Die „Ver-Schattung“ der Hausarbeit, in Marianne Gronemeyer et al. (Hg.): „Aber ich will nicht in diese Welt gehören...“ Beiträge zu einem konvivialen Denken nach Ivan

Illich, Bielefeld, Transcript, S. 165-181

____ 2021: (Ed.) Global WAR-NING! Geoengineering is Wrecking our Planet and Humanity, Montreal, Global Research,
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/global-war-ning-geoengineering-is-wrecking-our-planet-and-humanity/5753754>

____ (2022): Väter des Nichts. Zum Wahn einer Neuschöpfung der Welt, Höhr-Grenzhausen, Zeitgeist, forthcoming

Wolff, Ernst, 2017: Finanz-Tsunami – wie das globale Finanzsystem uns alle bedroht, Marburg, Büchner (s.a. Vorträge 2020, 2021)

Wood, Patrick, 2018: Technocracy. The Hard Road to World Order, Mesa, Az., Coherent Publishing

Featured image is from News Junkie Post

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof. Claudia von Werlhof](#), Global Research, 2021

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof. Claudia von Werlhof](#)

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