

An aerial photograph of a city, likely Hiroshima, showing a large, deep crater in the center. The buildings are densely packed, and the crater is a prominent feature. The image is in black and white, with a slightly faded, historical appearance.

# Fire and Shadow

the 'nothing if not' argument  
for Hollywood as propaganda

volume one

Richard Fogarty

# Fire and Shadow

the 'nothing if not' argument for  
Hollywood as propaganda

\*

Richard Fogarty

Although the author and publisher have made every effort to ensure that the information in this book was correct at the time of publication, the author and publisher do not assume and hereby disclaim any liability to any party for any loss, damage, or disruption caused by errors or omissions, whether such errors or omissions result from negligence, accident, or any other cause.

Copyright © 2020 Richard Fogarty

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by an electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review.

Photographic content copyright © 2018 Richard Fogarty

# Contents

## 0 Introduction

- Holly Wood, and Fire and Shadow
- The 'Nothing if Not' Argument
- The Tarot Effect
- Left, right, Left...
- Defining Other Terms
  - propaganda
  - social engineering
  - Fascist World Order (FWO)
  - 'White European' ('WE') and 'Non-White European' ('NWE')
  - Agenda / agenda
  - Narrative / narrative / Storyline
  - lionisation
  - Hollywood products
- Some Propagandisation Methods
  - the taxonomy of intersectionality
  - whitewashing
  - the Q'uranic principle
  - Narrative recipe
  - masking
  - tolerance

## 1 Wonder Woman (2017)

- the storyline
- Narrative 1: gender
- Narrative 2: World War Two (World War One)
- Narrative 3: race
- Narrative: other

## 2 Home (2015)

- the storyline
- Narrative 1: race (immigration)
- Narrative 2: race
- Narrative 3: gender
- Narrative: other

## 3 Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri (2017)

- the storyline
- Narrative 1: race
- Narrative 2: gender
- Narrative 3: the cancer scam
- Narrative 4: familial estrangement
- Narrative: other

## 4 Blade Runner 2049 (2017)

the storyline

Narrative 1: transhumanism

Narrative 2: race (slavery)

Narrative 3: CCH (climate change hoax)

Narrative 4: gender

Narrative 5: familial estrangement

Narrative: other

## 5 War for the Planet of the Apes (2017)

the storyline

Narrative 1: Jewish mythology

Narrative 2: race

Narrative 3: dystopian future

Narrative 4: familial estrangement

Narrative 5: the religion of evolution

Narrative: other

## 6 Bates Motel (2013 - 2017)

discussion

Narrative 1: familial estrangement

Narrative 2: gender (Norman)

Narrative 3: gender (men)

Narrative 4: gender (women)

Narrative 5: death

Narrative 6: race

Narrative: other

## 7 Okja (2017)

the storyline

Narrative 1: gender

Narrative 2: scarcity

Narrative 3: race

Narrative 4: familial estrangement

Narrative 5: the 'holocaust'

Narrative: other

## 8 Joker (2019)

the storyline

Narrative 1: evil capitalism

Narrative 2: race (and gender)

Narrative 3: gender (and race)

Narrative 4: inter/personal estrangement

Narrative: other

the media

masks

names

images

guns  
the numbers of the gateway  
Joker meets the world

media mentions

recommended related media

# 0

# Introduction

## Holly Wood, and Fire and Shadow

Movies have been made in Hollywood since 1911, and in the lives of many of us, this cinematic Mecca remains as much a theatrical backdrop as ever. The world's third largest movie market, it produces over 700 movies a year, a figure which, despite the ongoing decline in the number of movie theatres, has continued to climb, with the Disney / Buena Vista studio holding by far the largest Hollywood market share. This industry in California began when Jewish money and personnel began making their way from the east coast even before the arrangements for World War One could be finalised, and before the launch of the Titanic, and with those flavours on the air, it remains tempting to draw parallels between these business pioneers and the exiled Josephus Flavius (Yosef Ben Matityahu) of two millennia before, the Palestinian rabbi's-son-turned-propagandist-writer, exiled in Rome. As the main collaborator in the invention of Christianity in its biblical form, the comparison is also striking in being applicable to his anonymity in this respect, and the fact that the true purpose of his work remained known to few others. One can almost see him alive and well in the twentieth century, very much a Hollywood man, and continuing his war of collaboration with the empire. But, while there was always a pro-Jewish slant in Hollywood products, making propaganda a significant component of its DNA, overtly pro-Jewish propaganda is not what this is about, not least because financial ownership of parts of the industry no longer correlates with its propaganda content; pro-Chinese propaganda, as with pro-Jewish propaganda, for instance, remains minimal despite massive Chinese investment in Hollywood. Rather, because of developments in the modus operandi related to globalist control, the objective is, instead, to fulfil the aspirations of that Agenda through multiple agencies and ideologies, which is where leftism, in the spheres of social engineering and surface-level politics, fulfils its ultimately traditional purpose as a globalist tool, and why we are now examining media in order to understand where and how we are being led, in our otherwise uninformed acquiescence.

This investigation is a look at propaganda deployed as social engineering, rather than any such transparent championing of a single cause. Those controlling interests, among others less 'public', make use of the influential potential of Hollywood, among other things, as a route which is less direct and more effective in drawing closer to the realisation of the ultimate aims than any they have followed previously, not only as a mechanism of political control and repression, as was the case with the Abrahamic Religions, but also as a means of deploying real-world messages with an immediacy formerly only dreamed of. The abstraction of global media, unlike religions, allows for an infinite variety of nuance and application, more easily affecting the behaviour and emotions of massive numbers of people, and ultimately contributing harmoniously with other facets of globalism to control and profit from the general circumstances into which the global herd is driven and positioned. While the propaganda is easy enough to identify and categorise, it nevertheless represents real power, so it stands to reason that it has always attracted the attention of those whose *raison d'être* is the acquisition of ever greater power, meaning that Hollywood products have been

weaponised and deployed since its inception, regardless of whether or not that was its premeditated purpose.

Regarding the place name, although there is a quaint legend neatly accounting for the etymology, there are other more pertinent considerations. While being subject to Mars, the god of war, the wood of the holly tree also was considered, in ancient times, to have magical properties, specifically, in Roman terms, to subdue animals and compel their obedience to the wielder of the holly stick, which is interesting in terms of the mesmerisation of Hollywood audiences for over a century. Meanwhile, the Druidic religion also made use of this wood for magical purposes, as it is from a sacred tree in Celtic astrology, and we would call these 'magic wands'; the sacred spear of Odin, for instance, was made of holly wood. Appropriately, wands made from holly wood were used in magic related to sleep, while other presumed properties include influence over material advancement, physical revenge, and beauty. The American variety, meanwhile, is said to be the whitest wood in the world, and the light colour is presumed to have been a trait representing goodness, such that it could be used to channel positive energy for the benefit of the world; evidently, its namesake has been mis-used, to say the least, but while we might wait for nature or Gaia to redress the imbalances to which Hollywood has contributed, the remedy, an antidote, lies in our own hands.

Strikingly, magic, or magical reality, has featured often in Hollywood products, and we might include most of science fiction to be a branch of this. However, it is in the wider sense of its influence over the global culture of humanity, an influence which has always been presumed to be well-concealed in plain sight, that we might more correctly understand Hollywood's 'magic', and we would do well to bear in mind the 'Tarot' effect, discussed later, in this respect. Interestingly, in order to work this magic, use is made of that alter-ego of real magic, illusion; we are, in fact, naturally spell-bound by illusions of would-be reality, distracted by relationships and enmities, histories and wars, explosions and deaths, loves and romances, all faked, yet having effects on real lives in the real world.

To illustrate this, we might recall the image of Mickey Mouse as the sorcerer's apprentice in 'Fantasia' (1940), since both Mickey and magic encapsulate everything that Hollywood truly is. The brooms in that scene are 'magicked' wood, and have been brought alive, created and set in motion by Mickey using the magic inherent in the sorcerer's hat, meaning esoteric knowledge, which he is forbidden to use. Indeed, Mickey, being a personification, in an appropriately illusory sense, of Hollywood, is still an apprentice, representing the infantile, moneyed interests behind the Hollywood spell, and he makes a great mess of toying with the esoteric forces of nature, which, again, seems rather apt, and leads us again to consider how the imbalances might ultimately be redressed. And since we, the audiences, have participated and acquiesced in this experiment every step of the way, going blindly and almost happily, enslaved and conducted, about our prescribed business, we would not be exempt from the 'punishment' when it comes, as we face the wrath of forces we believe to be greater than ourselves, coming to the end of their patience, and may suffer the trials of a self-created, metaphorical deluge, just as the apprentice is shown to suffer, nearly drowning in the flood of his own making. In this allegory, however, we are the brooms, the LU.LU. of Sumerian history, created as slaves, then multiplying beyond the master's ability to control us, and will also suffer obliteration in the end, when the reckoning might come.

Hyperbole aside, the title of this book correlates with the mood of that scene because of the shadows, in that medieval setting, being cast by fire. The phrase, 'fire and shadow', is a reference to the Socratic dialogue about the inhabitants of the cave, in Plato's 'The Republic', Book 7, who, having spent their entire lives chained in there, mistake what they interpret from the flickering shadows on the walls, cast by fire, as reality, and will not accept that there is a three-dimensional world beyond their cave. This is a tragic indictment of the state of humanity, and shows us that nothing has changed in these few millennia. This is also a fitting metaphor for the cinematic experience, with the shadows printed on the (pre-digital) film, and its illusory images projected using light, onto a flat surface, and experienced as, or at least influencing, our individual and collective realities.



# The 'Nothing if Not' Argument

With the advent of the internet, the way we interacted, and interpreted media and information, changed. There was an exponential explosion of avenues of speculation and 'alternative' information, a review of the historical and contemporary falsehoods we had inherited in good faith, augmenting the truth research we had been consuming in books since the 1960s. The internet played its part in bringing even more issues to light, while ultimately heralding the onset of a full-blown information war, which later, predictably, developed into just another propaganda machine perpetuated by the reputation of its former ambitions, increasingly subject to the most severe, regime-sanctioned information manipulation, lies and censorship, and wedded to the weaponised, anti-social media; 'YouTube' became ThemTube; 'Facebook' became Faceban; 'Twitter' became Trigger; 'Whatsapp' was always Nothingsapp, and 'Google' was always GodGod, a combined arsenal introduced chiefly as a research tool, for the purpose of spying and collecting data on everyone, ultimately serving the agenda of much increased restriction and control, and generating little but isolation and depression for the users, especially among the young. This was topped off with the introduction of the smartphone and having internet access everywhere, a planned precursor to 5G, a continuous forced march to the gulag, in the service of the cancer industry, all disguised as informed choice.

All this time, almost unnoticed in plain sight, it seemed that the movie industry had also changed, continuing along its own trajectory into the internet age, which also became a hybrid internet-television age. This side of the '911' watershed, we woke up to find that a one-sided war had been raging silently under our noses for some time, and that the control over the minds of 'the people', the will to distract, confuse and bewilder them, to entertain them into oblivion, had somehow become a priority in this war. Not only this, but our true education also made it clear that the war was not being waged only through mendacious media, in the crucible of the worldwide web, but on every other front imaginable. We were simply 'not in Kansas anymore'.

Many authentic researchers have conclusively published elsewhere concerning many aspects of the information war, such that, with a little discernment and avoidance of the floods of distractors, we can find data on any topic we are interested in. Among this ongoing research and discussion sits information concerning Hollywood, its products and its history, and, especially pertinent to the topic of this book, its functioning as a tool of propaganda and social engineering. This has been true almost since the birth of cinema and Hollywood, and has become increasingly apparent with the passing of time, such that this is not, actually, news to anyone, and the fact that this is not a surprise or a revelation is an indication of how far we have already come down this road of widespread awakening to the true state and circumstances of humanity; if you had made such a statement so explicitly and assuredly even in the 1990s, your words would not have been understood, and you would have been ridiculed as a paranoid fool. But, that was another time, and we are not the same people; this is no longer the understanding, or even the interest, of a small minority. As such, we should consider the question of why, since Hollywood and its products are already widely understood to be used for propaganda and social engineering, such a book as this is necessary.

Quite simply, although many of us understand that Hollywood products contain propaganda, and many also perceive that this propaganda is exclusively left-leaning in nature (the misnomers 'progressive' or 'liberal' also apply, as well as 'identity politics' and 'cultural marxism'), it is not generally recognised that this is the main, if not the sole purpose of those products, a claim substantiated by the demonstrable fact that they contain nothing besides this kind of content; that there is no aspect of their production or, more to the point, content, which is not designed to serve this end. That is correct: it is not that there is, simply, 'a lot' of propaganda and social engineering, of a certain type; rather, there is no aspect of the script, not a moment of screen time, which is included except to serve the Agenda. This means that every line, every character, every event, as

well as the subtler aspects of location, wardrobe, and music, are all carefully considered and filtered through the lens of this service to the Agenda. This is why we often find ourselves wondering why a movie we have seen did not seem to fulfil its potential, or did not seem to go anywhere new, lacking cohesion and direction, despite massive funding and the dedication of a massive team of people, almost as if an immediate financial return was not a concern of its backers ('Elysium' (2013) springs to mind). This would be because the purpose of producing propaganda is prioritised over what the consumer considers to be its purpose, which sometimes results in movies which 'don't work', a phenomenon which is explicable when we understand what the real priorities are; in unpractised hands, the end results can be lamentable in terms of entertainment. However, it appears that a lot of progress has been made with this oversight, such that the propaganda is, most of the time, now very well made; compelling enough, anyway, to maintain the attention of consumers. It seems that notice was eventually taken, presumably in response to increasing consumer sophistication and discernment, of the fact that the trojan horse needs to be smart and convincing if the propaganda is to continue to reach its target.

It is worth repeating: although few people would disagree with the notion that propaganda and social engineering is, or can be, inserted into Hollywood products, the fact that this is the sole purpose of those products, and that e-v-e-r-y s-i-n-g-l-e one of their chief aspects is to serve a sociopolitical agenda in the service of a yet greater Agenda, remains something generally inconceivable, although a thorough analysis of any Hollywood product renders this conclusion inescapably obvious. Such an understanding can only be refuted if it has not been considered; if an individual is not predisposed to such speculation. This is fine, of course, since everyone is different, and we must be allowed our non-harmful differences according to what we used to know as 'common sense', but since we are talking about war, the weaponisation of the entertainment industry, combined with all other fields in which the war is waged (all fields have been weaponised, and are increasingly so, as a standard operational procedure), it behooves all of us to consider what impact this can have on all of us, our lives and the future lives of our descendants, our culture, our behaviour towards each other, and the destiny of our species.

Although we are sold the idea that, as a global community, we are always developing towards a time when we should be able to leave primitive, service-to-self behaviour behind us, and be allowed to work together, to contribute, as human beings, for the general benefit of all, if we are to be steeped in this war, to which the moronic, elitist minions of the regime, and their overlords, are fully committed, then we should, instead, consider how we might arm and defend ourselves. As such, a knowledge of your enemy, of their battle plans and weaponry, and the strengths and weaknesses of both sides, is surely a way of levelling the playing field. In short, we need to be better-informed, and as such, this analysis is a contribution to that defence, provided in the hope that a fuller awareness of this particular weapon will provide us with a choice, render the weapon and the spells impotent, and make us impervious to their objectives. In our understanding of the Hollywood code, our insight and knowledge of it, we become the Gnostics, able to read the true messages and intentions emanating from the holy wood, and leaving the literalists, and their surface-level reading of the same products, far behind.

This is a new and far-reaching perspective because, as with so many other civic and cultural institutions, we had been duped into believing that they had evolved with the purpose of maintaining and benefitting humanity, and our regimes still take for granted that we will continue to subscribe to the mythologies that, for example, schools and universities are purposed for education, thinking, and the fulfilment of potential; that science and academia are interested in pursuing research which benefits humanity or the planet; that medicine is interested in our health and well-being; that police and military forces, and the regime's non-accountable secret services, exist for our protection or, even more ironically, 'security'; that the individual has a say in the policies of their 'leaders' through the ballot box, and that elections and referenda themselves are generally impervious to corruption. Furthermore, in the case of the entertainment industry, it would be quite natural to assume that Hollywood, in catering to the entertainment needs of young and old alike, cannot serve an ulterior and despicable purpose; that it can only be benign by nature. The mythology would state that it is

an impartially creative endeavour, functioning as a profit- and market-driven business, reflecting the tribulations and aspirations of society, sincerely attempting to deal with questions of philosophy and the human condition for the average citizen, and, above all, to provide a means of escape from the inanity of our individual realities; a salve; a vehicle for personal catharsis. This unravelling is thus relatively surprising to most people because Hollywood movies enjoy such prevalence and omnipresence in our global culture that it would naturally be thought that nothing so insidious, in full view, could remain so undetected, for so long.

Indeed, much of this is also true; although Hollywood products may be considered plebian, they are nevertheless a part of the world of art and craft, employing creative people to bring the storylines to life, staffed by teams of many talented and qualified technicians, perhaps none of whom are aware of the true purpose of the industry which provides their paychecks. And Hollywood products have their benefits, despite their single-minded and onerous purpose. Even though, as it is said, something to the effect that 'the devil will tell a thousand truths to get you to believe one lie', and even though, in this case, we are speaking of many lies, it is not intended that we become significantly discouraged from consuming Hollywood products. Far from it: when armed with this knowledge, the experience of consuming these is greatly enhanced. When watching any movie or 'television' programme, besides continuing to have the choice to commit oneself emotionally to following a storyline, partaking in the experience of, ideally, the artistic merits of the product, one has the additional option of viewing everything on another level. One can rise to the challenge of following both strands simultaneously, or alternate between the two. In addition, one can enjoy the appreciation of the care and sophistication of how such craft is achieved, marveling at the attention to detail, and what appears to be the products' dual purpose, in the way one might experience poetry, like the multiplicity of interpretation found in the works of 'Shakespeare', for instance.

Hollywood products are designed to be entertaining and attractive, with a wide variety of genres catering for all tastes, to ensnare as many as possible in the metaphorical net. But if one is particularly concerned by the ongoing insult to one's intelligence, it can also be borne in mind that, in watching these movies with opened eyes, one is turning the tables, gratified that one is equaling or surpassing the intelligence of those behind the propaganda; it can be a very rewarding, ennobling and enriching experience, and provides one with the sensation more akin to that of an experimenter of art. In short, you can win, and they can lose. As has been pointed out, if you apply some thought to such matters, 'You begin to know your enemy better than your enemy knows you' (Jones, 2019). Pulling away the blinkers and shining a spotlight on the issue can negate the powerful potential of propaganda and provide a kind of liberation from its negative effects. All it takes is becoming aware of the craft, the purpose of Hollywood, and, to some extent, the favoured narratives which comprise the propaganda. This is a single step, after which one never needs to go back; just as any consideration of this analysis cannot be sincerely gainsaid, once the fact is fully comprehended, one remains in no doubt thereafter about its veracity. However, this is not to say that this step is an easy one to take, for it entails, for most people, an overturning of belief systems, in part or in entirety, which can be a slow process. Nevertheless, while some will be naturally repelled by it, those who are called to the questioning are unable to help themselves, and will be drawn easily along the path to this and other realisations in this vein.

Meanwhile, Hollywood is also a business, apparently robust enough to withstand the vicissitudes of wavering and indeterminate numbers of end-users. Many in the Hollywood industry would claim that movie projects attract investment for development, or are green-lighted, or not, entirely for financial reasons. But while that appears to be true on the surface, it is merely a reflection of how the Hollywood business is currently run, and this arrangement would be apt to change in the event of an imminent collapse of that industry; hypothetically speaking, as long as it would continue to serve its true purpose, it would pick up enough anonymous funding to do so, provided by those of the planetary-ownership persuasion who benefit from the propaganda itself, directed through other parties playing the usual part of innocent capital investors. And there is a point to this: it needs to appear to be run as an industry with recognisable business considerations, in order to retain that

all-important plausible deniability should it ever come to needing to justify its products. Thus, its very existence is a statement of propaganda.

Regardless of the demands of the market, the aim, since we are speaking of propaganda, is to ensure that the product reaches as many people as possible, which is why, despite official declarations to the effect that copying and distributing others' creations is illegal, and that offenders may be prosecuted, all Hollywood content remains available free of charge, online, in order to ensure that those who cannot financially afford to pay for their own copies, a demographic arguably more targeted than most, can also be caught in the net of consumerism and partake of the propaganda. Although there may even be prosecutions for copyright infringement, and publicity of such, and a show of support for this law, this would only ever be a pretence, very similar to the publicity of police action against drug smugglers, distributors and dealers; the pretence implies that such prosecution is the true will of the regime, allowing for the status quo to be perpetuated. Given a genuine intent, it would be as simple a matter to remove harmful drugs from our nations as to remove media pirating, streaming and torrent-share sites from the internet.

And, since the media, including Hollywood of course, is almost entirely owned by those waging that war against humanity, we are presented only with the enemy's side of the story, which is forced in through any remaining chinks in the wall, to try to place it before a very distracted citizenry; a creative challenge. Indeed, the only escape from Hollywood products, as with so many other fields, media and otherwise, would be near-total disengagement. While this looks like a logical option, many would agree that removing oneself completely from the onslaught would mean that we do not know what is happening in that aspect of our world in which most people exist. While a small minority are fortunate in being able to renounce this consensus, materialist reality, replacing the usual pursuits and distractions with their own vocations, this is not easy for most of us; we may not be physically, mentally, spiritually or socially inclined to secede from the greater tide, or we may be simply attracted to consume and engage with what the world produces, or we may feel drawn to witness and record, or to do battle with, the horror of what is produced, due to personal indignation; people play their small parts in counteracting the Agenda in their own ways. Those who are further along the path to this kind of realisation will pick up and adopt this information more easily, while others will struggle with it. That is very natural, and is one of the differences between us which ought to be celebrated rather than decried.

This book is necessary, therefore, to point out what is being done in the name of art, business and entertainment. The only reason this would not be important is if it were considered acceptable to be constantly bombarded with propaganda from only one direction, which is to say: programming, political bias, social engineering, false or skewed history, all augmented and intensified by exploiting our emotional buy-in, not to mention a general 'dumbing-down' and the detraction from any non-mainstream, non-satanically-sanctioned art and entertainment, with which Hollywood is also at war. Furthermore, and despite the fact that there remain many people who are unaware of the true, main purpose of Hollywood, it should be understood that this thesis does not take a hypothetical stance on this issue; the fact of Hollywood-as-propaganda is taken as a given, and this exposure is decidedly not about making the case for its existence. Unfortunately, because most of the discussions concerning Hollywood-as-propaganda are generalised, unsubstantiated and incidental, it remains easy for such commentary to be dismissed as just another talking point or alternative perspective. Instead, this analysis intends to live up to the likes of Devon Stack and Jay Dyer, with whose detailed work on deconstructing movies this discussion would aim to unite, contribute and underline, taking the consideration of Hollywood products beyond the basics, and to give them as much attention and commitment in their unravelling as is given to their creation. The purpose here is thus to illustrate the case clearly, by way of example and discussion, at an unprecedented level of detail.

Incidentally, as a result of the analysis undertaken for the purposes of this discussion, and part of the evidence which makes the case for the thesis, it can be seen that the level of detail included in Hollywood products is too often of such intricate and subtle integration that Hollywood scripts cannot

be the work of unwitting authors or amateurs in the service of propaganda. On the contrary, it is apparent that Hollywood products are envisaged as propaganda from the outset of each project, that each movie is evidently selected for realisation based on its propaganda potential, and the plots and scripts in their entirety are authored by experts who know exactly what they are working towards in terms of propaganda, from the very start. Indeed, script integrity and theatrical impact is considered only as a means to an end, in support of the main purpose. In short, the movie scripts, apparently, seldom result from taking the finished work of a regular screenwriter and giving it a gloss of propaganda, with a tweak here and there, as understood by Alford and Secker in their analysis of military oversight of movie references to the U.S. military. On the contrary, Hollywood products are structured as propaganda from the get-go, which should rather leave us pitying so many aspiring and capable screenwriters who are perennially sidelined, yet tragically continue to believe that there is something lacking in their ability, connections, or even luck, which prevents them from having their work considered for production; the only ones who can be allowed through the door are those who will have been vetted for traits of compliance and compromise, and even of familial connection or political allegiance. In this way, as long as the pool of screenwriters who are admitted to the closed ranks have proven their screenwriting abilities, their skill with their craft can be utilised all the better for the purposes of effective propaganda. Indeed, while nearly all staff involved in the production of a movie can remain ignorant of the true purpose of that movie as propaganda, this cannot be claimed for the screenwriters; almost above everyone else, they or their handlers are employed in the full knowledge of a movie's true purpose.

It is also worth mentioning that, while a consideration of the propagandistic nature of Hollywood can be a catalyst for an unravelling and eventual overturning of one's worldview, allowing some insight into the world we really live in, as opposed to the one composed of false narratives and distractions from truth, this is also true of countless other areas of information. One will be called, as mentioned, to those areas which most align with one's interests and emotional vibration. For instance, some might find themselves drawn to a part of history, or a spiritual teaching, or the workings of the pharmaceutical industry, or the education industry, or the mainstream 'news' industry, or even some of the many more serious areas of criminal enterprise perpetrated by the thieving-elite class - the list is practically infinite - uncovering information which one realises has theretofore been suppressed or misrepresented, thereby prompting the important question as to why, and a subsequent unravelling of one's worldview. While the consideration of Hollywood is just one of one many areas with such potential, it has been selected for analysis here because, firstly, it is accessible, interesting, and fun, the analysis being an extension of the entertainment under consideration; and secondly, it can be an especially powerful path to enlightenment regarding the false, consensus worldview, for those who enjoy watching movies, and this, it is assumed, is most people.

In considering why movies are used for the dissemination of propaganda, instead of being left to other media, this would be a matter of human psychology; we all have different preferences and habits, so in order to reach everyone, every sphere must be used. Taking all this a step further than Joseph Goebbels, who is famously quoted as saying 'propaganda works best when those who are being manipulated are confident they are acting on their own free will', there will be people who watch only movies, or only television, or only 'news', or only look at fashion magazines, or only listen to this kind of music, or that kind of art, etc. People make choices about their what they fill their lives with, and will engage more deeply with those things they have chosen, which makes messaging through these channels all the more effective. Compare the potency of messages associated with people in a field in which you take no interest, with those of people you empathise with, or look up to. Especially for young people, this would be entrainment by example, exploiting a natural tendency for us to imitate those we admire. The point is that, as long as every avenue possible is under the control of the propagandists, they are certain to have their messages get through to us. Add to this the opinions of your peers, received and imitated through their own chosen channels, and then add to this the fact that we each receive the same messaging through multiple channels anyway, and there is a genuine recipe for narrow-mindedness, groupthink, and a severe impediment to independent thought or action. Again, add to this the great attraction and fascination of movies for

many people, especially compared to the relatively unappealingly dry and serious look of 'news' propaganda, and it is clear why Hollywood is also used.

In this regard, we might recall Bad Cop, an insider, in 'The Lego Movie' (2014), saying to Emmet, who has just announced his belief in the integrity of the omnipotent, regime-run corporation, Octan: 'You can't be this stupid!', a message apparently from an insider to the audience, and likely not meant cynically or patronisingly, since this movie includes many instances of insider, white-hat messaging mixed in with the propaganda, as does 'The Matrix' (1999), for instance, which is all much like the metaphor of the man behind the curtain in 'The Wizard of Oz' (1939). Indeed, there are many instances of home truths, about how we are controlled, being shown to us, which is interpreted by one school of thought as being a way of circumventing the necessity of acquiring our permission directly; what is shown to be done is more easily perpetrated in the real world because we have been shown it and have not objected, believing it to be fiction. In this regard, consider 'The Devil' Tarot card, where the people depicted as being chained are prisoners by choice. Some would cite this as a universal law which ensures that the enslavement and attempted destruction of Earth's human population, in order to steal our planet from us, is not interfered with by any outsiders. Others would cite this, instead, as a function of magic.

## The Tarot Effect

We are thus able to turn now more fully to the Tarot effect, in illustrating a wider purpose for movie propaganda. This concerns the seeding of desired outcomes by visually depicting them, a mystical predictive programming. To explain this, we need to consider both how events come to occur in the real world, and how consultation with Tarot cards or, indeed, other approximations of these, such as coffee and tea leaf residues, or the i-Ching, regarding future events, often yield 'correct' information. For those of a rationalistic or concrete scientism mindset, who regard astrology, for instance, as superstitious nonsense, these other predictive systems would appear as even more absurd, since, unlike astrology, their 'system' appears even more random and unconnected to the events they suggest could occur. This belief is itself an unfortunate consequence of long-term social engineering which has led most people into a cul-de-sac of viewing the world only according to what can be physically proven. Although, at first sight, this would seem to be a natural, logical, safe way of navigating life, it soon adopts its own set of religious positions, whereby adherents' beliefs are maintained despite contradictory, often irrefutable evidence which either disproves a scientific belief or maxim, or provides a more dependable alternative. This results in what has become corruption in academia, with peer-reviewed, scientific journals publishing papers with falsified findings, and suppressing the publication of papers which challenge the belief system of the scientific establishment. This, of course, is also due to the fact that this part of the greater establishment edifice is as controlled as any other. The ease with which those who proudly refer to themselves as 'scientific' - which is actually a cop-out - and a tacit disparaging of anyone they deem to be 'unscientific', when considered alongside the astrologers, shamans and Tarot consultants, tells us that all human beings are predisposed to making use of beliefs which cannot be proven or evidenced to the satisfaction of others. We speak here of that which, in combination with other inherent instincts, also readily manifests as prejudice, bias, and bigotry, and this, being a weakness as well as a potential strength for our species, is fundamentally what the current thesis is concerned with.

In simple terms, it is not that events which occur in the world are acausal; rather, they are not solely caused by action and reaction, but also by intent. This has been summarised by statements citing a combination of belief and expectation, as being the agents of manifestation, without which the said actions and reactions would not yield results; it is only insofar as belief and expectation is combined with those actions that results can manifest. According to an immature or unknowing intellect, to put it politely, the results certainly appear to be caused by action, and are easily attributable to action alone, and yet there is, in all of us, a knowing that this cannot be the whole story. Even though

apologists for scientism will be able to rationalise events, including every supposed coincidence, only in terms of their narrower understanding, we are all still prone, at a less quantifiable level, to make use of beliefs we cannot prove. Indeed, we function in this way all of the time, making extensive use of machinery and computers about which we understand nothing; we do not need to understand how something works in order to use it, or, more to the point, to believe in its function. This is natural to us, hence, the widespread practices of positive thinking for teams in sport and business, the unfortunate adherence to religious (and scientific) dogma, and the appeal of stories involving magical reality, which, perhaps, brings us back to the point.

What we see, witness, hear about, or are told, is more likely to dominate our attention, our mental focus or lack-of-focus, than things we do not see or hear about. This stands to reason. Furthermore, those things which dominate our thoughts, and the overt and covert messages we perceive within them, are more likely to form part of our belief system than those other things we never pay attention to, and this is more true of repeated encounters with those messages. As a result, what we see, witness, hear about, or are told, is more likely to manifest in reality, than those other things. And, not only is this potential or likelihood enhanced by repetition, but also by numbers of people similarly focussed, which is why religions advocate praying together. We are speaking of self-perpetuating systems. So, in considering the Tarot, a set of images which are open to interpretation individually or in combination, we can understand how focussing, with great interest and emotional investment, on the messages in the cards, can manifest events in an individual's life experience in the real world. In addition, the fact that these are images means they are, for most people, more easily absorbed, experienced, and processed at a core or primal level, than words spoken or written, or ideas which are abstract but not expressed visually. They are simultaneously suggestive and specifiable, and become set up as icons in the temple of the open and emotionally-engaged observer. If we extrapolate to imagine such potential invested in moving imagery, which is colourful and realistic, you can see where we are going with this. And this is not a magic provided by the cards or the images; rather, they are a catalyst for what is being manifested by the believer. And belief has everything to do with it, too: one who does not believe in what they are told by a Tarot reader, or an astrologist, or a nutritionist, or a doctor or dentist, is far less likely to meet with the said, or hoped-for, outcomes than someone who believes. This results in a rather tragic tautology, whereby 'scientific' people are unable to manifest the very evidence which might help to enlighten them.

Thus, the Tarot is an excellent metaphor for Hollywood and its products, with a power to assist, to say the least, in the manifestation not only of desired behaviour but also of desired outcomes. The Hollywood version of the cards, however, with the same imagery alternately juxtaposed in different combinations as the narratives are reshuffled for each product, are only to be interpreted negatively; as with all fields of human endeavour, all serving the Agenda, there are no positive outcomes intended. And the beauty of such a system is that belief in the Tarotic power of Hollywood products is not a prerequisite for being affected and used as a receiver and an antenna in the transmission of the messages, of which these products are composed in their entirety; Hollywood products are more than just programming, and this is all the more reason for the need for our collective awareness of this power, this weapon and the intentions of those who wield it. And this is the point: those running the Hollywood scam are quite aware of its Tarotic potential; it is deployed in full knowledge of the effects it can have. The understanding of how reality is manifested is ancient knowledge which the various iterations of the FWO (fascist world order) through the millennia have worked hard to prevent being general knowledge, partly because they consider it to be one of their personal secret weapons, which we are neither supposed to know about nor use to our own advantage. Since propaganda works hand-in-glove with this understanding, much importance has been given to media and information propagated throughout those millennia, while eventually manifesting such a thing as Hollywood must have seemed to them almost too good to be true.

This knowledge is practically an unspoken mantra in Hollywood, which they first broadcast, as part of their 'disclosure' tactic, in 1940, in the opening song of the animation, 'Pinocchio'. The lyrics are important enough to be referenced in the opening sequence to many Disney products, as the tune, instrumental only, is reiterated with the animation of magic dust, and the image of the Disney,

Egyptian 'pyramid' palace, this being a reference to Disney and Hollywood's intersection with freemasonic interests (other clues arise with the use of number 33, for instance), with the magic dust outlining the Earth's hemisphere, one of the main symbolic attributes of the 'Great Pyramid' in Cairo, thus signifying an ownership of, or dominance over, the planet. Although the words of this song can be taken as something from a fairy tale, told to children to distract them and be instantly forgotten, they serve as an instruction for manifestation, and can be seen as the insiders' message to themselves, rather than for the audience: 'When you wish upon a star, makes no difference who you are: anything your heart desires will come to you. If your heart is in your dream, no request is too extreme, when you wish upon a star, as dreamers do. Fate is kind. She brings [...] the sweet fulfillment of their secret longing. [...] When you wish upon a star, your dreams come true'. One wonders, then, at the common Hollywood use of the word 'star' for actor, that vehicle through which those who are party to this knowledge and the casting of cinematic spells make their connection to the greater universe and draw upon the energy engendered by human beings - themselves and the audience - to invest symbols and images with magical power. Hollywood did not originate the usage of this word to signify actors, but it certainly took ownership of it once the industry was established; now those unwitting shamans have their names etched in pentagrams along eighteen blocks of Hollywood sidewalks.

Regarding specifics, we might consider that, in addition to providing opinions and models for the consumer to imitate, there are more fantastical depictions, as we see in futuristic storylines, which are often deployed with content such as dystopias, a ravaged earth, and AI technology, for instance, which are often intended to represent totalitarian regimes, the results of 'climate change', and transhumanism, respectively. First of all, it will be noticed that these are all negative scenarios, things which represent a loss of liberties we currently enjoy. These scenarios do not exist, so the near future is an expedient place for them, and it is such a future which the FWO are evidently intending to create. And they will do this with our assistance and mute permission every step of the way. With repeated exposure, to millions of people, of images of dystopian societies, this becomes a more likely future; With repeated exposure, to millions of people, to images of a ravaged earth, this becomes a more likely future; With repeated exposure, to millions of people, to images of the replacement of human beings with AI technology, this becomes a more likely future. Thus, generally speaking, in terms of this selection, we have cultural engineering, by removing hope and faith in each other; propaganda, in pushing the CCH (climate change hoax); and predictive manifestation in the portrayal of totalitarian regimes and global depopulation.

Incidentally, the negative purposing of this content is also significant in a general sense. The science of manifestation is qualified by the fact that the specified content, the object of one's focus, will often not result in the manifestation of that object because, to be more precise, what is manifested is a vibrational, rather than a literal match, and this is driven by one's emotional vibration. This means that the vibrational signature of a manifestation will always match the vibrational signature of the one who experiences it, so that, in terms of that expectation, for example, the focus on a loved one's illness may not result in oneself becoming ill, but, instead, in another apparent misfortune, such as losing one's wallet to a thief, for instance, as long as this is a match to the emotions of the focuser-experiencer, which may, nevertheless, have been engendered by the emotions concerning the loved one's illness. Due to the great variety of variables in any given instance, which are all changing moment to moment, one cannot predict what will be manifested, or how long it might take to become reality. This is something generally misunderstood by those who purport to make use of this science for manifesting a better life for themselves, not least because of the misinformation propagated online and in the market place, by those who would prefer that this knowledge is still kept a 'secret'; if it is tried out while the fuller understanding is absent, it can lead to disappointment, and even negative results, which helps to discredit the entire science.

More to the point in this thesis, the portrayal of a future Earth ruined by the actions of humanity, for instance, may not result in that manifestation. Although it could make this more likely in a literal sense, the intention would be more in order to tune the audience's vibration towards the lower end of the spectrum, so that expectations are generally negative and the audience is in a place of



negative expectation and belief, allowing for the increased potential for any manifestations which would be experienced as negative for the audience or, since emotions also leave their signature permanently in time and space, people in the future. Since anything which depraves, destroys or depresses humanity is a positive outcome for the FWO, as much negativity as possible is seeded through Hollywood product, as elsewhere; just as 'no news is good news', so also, 'good news is no news'.

This is why great efforts are made to erase anything positive in socio-cultural terms from everyone's lives. In concert with all other aspects of human society, Hollywood is also tasked with removing positive experience and lowering the vibrational-emotional tone of humanity. All of this helps to ensure that the actions taken to promote the ongoing abuse and destruction of humanity will meet with success more often than not. However, this is not proving as easy as anticipated, since the naturally high, emotional, default setting for human beings is difficult to keep depressed; action needs to constantly be taken to depress it, especially for young children. Not only this, but it appears, poetically and entertainingly, that the harder the FWO pushes, the more difficult their task becomes; when the contempt which the elite have for us becomes clear to any individual, the natural human reaction is to resist, and the more blatantly we are insulted and attacked, the more we resist. This is the problem with information, of course, and why the internet is another item, besides eternal hope, released from Pandora's box, which represents a threat to the long-held status quo of the FWO. This is why the internet is a battlefield, where war is being waged on information, why disinformation is more significant than it has ever been, and why technology, since that cat is partly out of the bag, is being used to ensnare, depress and monitor us. Indeed, the FWO now struggles to meet with much success at all, in terms of advancing their long-pursued plans, while their satanic empire seems only to be fading, and, having nothing to lose, they push harder, becoming more obvious in their intentions, thus promoting greater resistance. This is why a large part of this war also depends on the toxification of humanity, growing the cancer and mental health industries to maximise misery, distraction, profit, and control. It is why 'dumbing down', illiteracy, and ignorance, are important. It is why the content of Hollywood products is almost all negative, and why death themes feature strongly; think: vampires, torture, murder, all more realistically and graphically depicted than ever before. And if there is any 'comedy' or 'romance' produced, it will be qualified with all manner of cynicism while promoting the same Narratives as the other products.

## Left, Right, Left...

The control of humanity has always been of great concern to those 'people' who consider themselves the owners of our planet and all its resources, among which they have always counted us as cattle. In this regard, individualism is the enemy, and leftism suits the owners best. There is a clue to this in the pharaonic statuary of ancient Egypt, where only the left leg, if any, will be placed as leading the way, which may be related to their methods of societal control. But since this theory cannot be proven either way, and even if this were not the case after all, the pharaonic system is nevertheless worth considering in relation to our full definition of leftism. It is the contention here that the leftist path, the pharaonic way, the monarchic iron-fisted rule of an elite over a servile population, is the path which is less natural to our instincts, and does not serve us well. It should certainly never be allowed to be employed to the extremes we have witnessed in our own lifetimes, because it is indeed the sinister path, only useful when used piecemeal and under strict controls; we always find ourselves in a pharaonic situation if it is allowed to have its way.

The FWO, although it would favour the use of any tool which advances its Agenda, is easily seen to favour the sinister path as best suited to its purposes. In order to do so, it needs to propagate false information about what both the rightist and the leftist paths mean. For instance, leftism supports the removal of all societal power from individuals, for it to be centralised in the hands of state bureaucracy, such that as many of the details of our lives as possible are controlled and

engineered by a non-accountable few. This is evidently inhuman, unnatural, and bad for us as individuals and societies. In order to sell this damaging ideology, people are told only that it is about sharing the resources in order that the weakest in society are catered for. But we can see what happens when this goes awry, which, since human beings are generally not immune to being human, it always does; it comes back, every time, to the catering only for the laziness, greed and perversions of a dangerously violent, self-appointed, elite and their most committed adherents. Although there is some merit in leftism, because any civilised society needs to provide sustenance for all its members, this needs to be carefully monitored, in order that it does not become exploitative or ideological, though it is a strong invitation to both, and thankfully, the nature of a free-market economy works well as a check on it.

The result of unchecked leftism, as is evident in the degenerative societies we labour under today, is that, noting the arrival of the bandwagons, many different categories of people clamour for disadvantaged status, claiming theirs to be another type of victimhood which needs to be redressed in order to provide a level playing field. What is almost worse, insult is constantly added to injury because in order to enforce such a system, lies have to be told and maintained, so that science and history are perverted, and any true education is seen as a threat to the stability of the state. The labour movements of the nineteenth century, for instance, are selectively held up as an example of why socialism has a place in a civilised society. Of course, there is logic and moral rightness in this, too; it has always been difficult to withdraw one's labour without starving to death, and it became necessary to address imbalances which had arisen and flourished under industrialisation and the theft of the land under that particular pharaonic system. However, nobody would disagree with the rightness of the labour movements, that grass-roots level of collectivisation for mutual protection against the machinery of the state, but this qualifies as propaganda because it is not representative of what leftism ultimately aspires to, and what it challenges us with at its extremes.

Another result is the increasing need to repress dissenting voices, which incorporates misrepresenting them, and a concomitantly increasing need for adherents of the dogma to delude themselves about their real world experiences. All of this is where Hollywood comes in, and this inverted fantasy world which leftists inhabit is epitomised in such mendacities as the following exchange from 'The OA' (2016-2019) (2.2), when a detective makes a phone call to a computer-savvy friend:

'How are you, Mo?'

'I'm with an author who's about to publish a feminist text. I'm in all of her accounts so she doesn't get hacked, doxed, terrorised, stalked; you name it.'

'Right, so, the usual.'

Bizarrely, in these throwaway remarks, we are being told that feminists ('liberals': leftists) are regularly hacked and doxed online, physically stalked, and generally terrorised, even though these actions have never been undertaken by non-leftists, and yet are frequently undertaken by leftists in their state-sponsored harassment of, and frequent violence towards, anyone they can find who disagrees with their ideology; the extremity of such hypocrisy and cynicism is truly breathtaking, but is no surprise if one considers what leftism and its necessary methods are. What is more, such immoral, unlawful and unethical behaviour is peer- and state-sanctioned, as well as being funded using public or stolen money, in that perverted, echo-chamber, alternative reality which we call 'clown world'. It is even considered virtuous, since the defenceless 'enemy' have once again been attacked and beaten, a self-fulfilling justification illustrative of the Rodney King effect.

The Hollywood products analysed here yield the following most commonly deployed Narratives:

gender

race (including slavery, immigration, Judaism, and anti-Christianity)

familial estrangement

anti-humanism (including transhumanism, nihilism and pro-Darwinism)

World Wars 1+2 (including demonisation of Nazi Germany)

the CCH (including future dystopias)  
death (including cancer)  
collectivism / anti-individualism (including firearms)  
anti-capitalism

These Narratives very often intersect or, rather, the deployment of one serves to reference another, thus profitably exploiting multiple Narratives simultaneously. Sometimes these are subtle or suggestive, mutually-reinforcing or even masking, while others are overt. Examples include the following:

firearms + death  
the demonisation of men + the demonisation of 'WE' people  
the demonisation of men + familial estrangement  
the demonisation of Nazi Germany + the demonisation of men + race  
the CCH + transhumanism

However, it must be said that attention given to the gender narrative outweighs all of the others, with race generally coming in second, and familial estrangement, third. These three make up the greater bulk of the propaganda, far in excess of any of the others, so are easily identified as the narratives most sacred to Hollywood. Notably, little is propagated in terms of sexual deviancy. This is left to all other media and avenues of propaganda to deal with, including television; the specialisation is necessary in order not to overburden the recipe. As a result, it has become the easiest thing in the world to state that Hollywood is as sexist and racist as it is possible to be, and thus represents an obscenity beyond description. Furthermore, self-policing and self-categorisation, according to theories about what leftism and rightism are, serves only to obstruct our reversion to what is most natural and best for everyone. These labels need to be rejected, in fact, in order for the separate issues to be considered on their own merit. In this way, it should be a simple matter for anybody to acknowledge that sexism and racism are both reprehensible, instead of pushing confused people, slaves to the leftist religion, to believe that sexism and racism are to be applauded when they fit a particular sociopolitical agenda.

If it appears that attention being given to such topics is distasteful, that is because it really is distasteful, but that ugliness emanates not from ourselves, but from Hollywood, whose products, we should always bear in mind, do not reflect our human society; no amount of 'grittiness' is ever going to fool us. The problem is that the obscenity is so overbearing and overt, and can have such a negative effect on people in the real world, that it cries out, like any one of the psychopathic crimes of the FWO, to be exposed, defined, and undone, and the perpetrators, if not called to account, at least known for what they are and what they do.

## Defining Other Terms

The usual treatment of messaging and symbolism in Hollywood products makes use of discursive analysis centred around a selection of those products in order to illustrate a general thesis, and the approach here will be similar, except that the scope and level of detail will be much more comprehensive. This is mainly necessitated by the thesis, which differs from the analysis of others in maintaining that there is no Hollywood product content, in a macroscopic sense, that is not included except to serve the Agenda. As such, every moment of each selected item has been considered, a level of detail which ultimately means that not many Hollywood products can be covered here. However, such an approach is necessary if we are to establish the irrefutability of this thesis; it is a matter of proving what most people merely suspect, which can only be done with such a level of analysis. In this, it is intended that enlightenment is provided for: those few who would deny the existence of social engineering in Hollywood products; those who had not considered the

topic before; and for those who accept that this exists, but had not considered either its true extent or nefarious purposes. Once this is achieved, and the coding understood, it becomes easier for a consumer of Hollywood products to recognise the design in any such product, so that such a level of detail in further analyses becomes unnecessary.

On this point, it is worth noting, in order to distinguish this work from that of other commentators such as Devon Stack, that effort has been made to refer to very recent Hollywood products, rather than older ones. Stack has qualified his approach by correctly stating that the older products are more difficult to interpret, the later ones being rather too obvious, and thus less interesting in terms of revelation. While this is true, since Hollywood has been deployed as a social engineering weapon from its inception, it is also true that the way it is deployed has greatly changed, not merely in becoming more obvious, but also with respect to the level of detail. However, much more important is the alteration in the amount of content in any given product: whereas in the past, roughly prior to the '911' watershed, or the turn of the millennium, Hollywood products made much less use of layering the selected Narratives, focussing instead on one main Narrative in each product, with any other propaganda being minor and incidental, while, post-watershed, we discern a different approach, with a number of main Narratives - at least three - deployed at full strength in each product, besides other, incidental features. This reflects a belief not only in consumer sophistication, but also in receptivity to the Narratives which, having been promoted to the exclusion of all dissenting or contradictory perspectives for decades, has normalised them for the consumer; they would expect to see nothing else; this all looks normal to them. It reflects the way that society has been engineered to be perceived in the real world, so nothing in the Narratives is jarring, and they can be stacked more densely, with much less expectation or need for the inconvenient intrusion of light relief within a given storyline, than previously.

The products selected for analysis here are major Hollywood projects, of the type whose Narratives are considered with the most care, and which are earmarked, because of their propagandistic potential, for maximum investment. They are also selected to cover a range of genres and Narratives, in order to establish the Hollywood modus operandi most clearly. In clarifying the thesis, use is commonly made of a few noteworthy terms:

### propaganda

To define propaganda, the common, online definitions serve us well, since they clearly represent the agendas promoted by all Hollywood products. We are told that propaganda is 'information, ideas, or rumors deliberately spread widely to help or harm a person, group, movement, institution, nation, etc.'. This is achieved through unchallenged dogma, being the 'particular doctrines or principles' of leftism. All this serves 'to influence an audience and further an agenda, which may not be objective and may be presenting facts selectively to encourage a particular synthesis or perception, or using loaded language to produce an emotional rather than a rational response to the information that is presented' (Wikipedia). This implies a disjunction between reality and belief, such that propaganda 'begins where critical thinking ends' (Snow). Furthermore, maintaining this cognitive dissonance needs management and mendacious intervention, to prevent any natural recourse to logic, such that propaganda 'serves as a corollary to censorship in which the same purpose is achieved, not by filling people's minds with approved information, but by preventing people from being confronted with opposing points of view. What sets propaganda apart from other forms of advocacy is the willingness of the propagandist to change people's understanding through deception and confusion rather than persuasion and understanding' (Wikipedia).

### social engineering

Social engineering, on the other hand, entails propaganda, rather than the other way around, since it refers to any efforts to 'influence particular attitudes and social behaviours on a large scale,

whether by governments, media or private groups in order to produce desired characteristics in a target population' (ibid). Although it may often take the form of propaganda, it is useful as an additional phrase here because it signifies the intent and effect of propaganda, bringing that term closer to home and showing it to be both ubiquitous and emanating from controlling, self-appointed 'authorities'.

### Fascist World Order (FWO)

This is a more precise way of referring to that which has been called the 'New World Order', being composed of those few inhuman 'people' who presume to control and own the planet and all its resources, including human beings, to use as they wish, and aided by: surface-level politicians, who are merely actors, both witting and unwitting; all controlled media; and the people to police themselves and each other. The term 'fascist' is used because the Agenda is pursued by deploying those attributes which can be ascribed to fascism: specifically: collectivisation and the removal of individuality as part of the 'regimentation of society', 'dictatorial power', and 'forcible suppression of opposition'. It is intended that, every time this term is used, one remembers that we are dealing with a perverse, degenerate, inhumane, pharaonic system which presumes to control everything; theirs is the agenda to bring ruin to all human society and to complete their task of absolute ownership of the planet, disposing of the bulk of the global population in the process.

### 'White European' ('WE') and 'Non White European' ('NWE')

'WE' refers to people of European descent, but needs some qualifying. Although southern Europeans (Greece, Italy and Spain) are also descended from Arabic and Turkish settlers, this is now hundreds of years in the past, the assimilation has run its course, and they can still be classed as 'WE' for the purpose of this thesis. However, this would also be in recognition of the fact that they are geographically European, and were also European, as opposed to African or Asian, before certain resettlements occurred in the past; they have always been a part of Europe geographically, as determined by the Mediterranean Sea, and have always been a part of European culture. Their languages are also European and, for the most part, related. If things had occurred differently in the past, we might also have been including parts of the Middle East in this definition, but geography, culture and language leads us to omit North Africa and the Middle East from our definition of Europe. Although caucasians are very mixed, we would also classify Europeans as being white. However, in recognition that very few people on the planet have skin which is literally white or literally black, these adjectives are placed in inverted commas, since 'white' and 'black' are merely broad categories of convenience to be used for the distasteful discussions which have been forced upon us. Also, due to historical events, the term 'WE' also encompasses North America, Australasia and South Africa, having been settled predominantly by Europeans, and in which those whose land was stolen from them and their people killed, became a minority (except for South Africa).

South America, however, is more difficult to define. Even though its countries could be categorised as 'WE', it is not to be considered as such here, in part because, despite speaking Spanish or Portuguese, its cultures and peoples are evidently less European, having been mixed, much more than in the U.S.A., with the many indigenous peoples who survived the large-scale European invasions which began in the fifteenth century, and never having been comprised of the fuller range of European peoples. The other reason is that South American countries have always been economically suppressed, chiefly due to the actions of the regimes of the U.S.A., which has resulted in what looks to be an economic definition, conveniently demarcated by a single border at the north of Mexico, making also for a geographical definition. Furthermore, in terms of the discussion here, South American countries, although severely damaged by covert actions of successive U.S.A. regimes, are not being victimised and damaged by the engineered mass-migration which has defined contemporary debate about 'WE' identity. Rather, they are being used as a means by which North America is damaged.

This leads us to the reason for the agenda of weaponised migration, as well as the racism directed only at 'WE' people across all media. The cultures and traditions of 'WE' countries make them resistant to globalist leftism, while also being one of the main obstacles to global dominance. In addition, China, and more especially, Russia, which has remained less cooperative with the satanic globalist agenda since the obscene destruction of Libya in 2011, are the other main components to be 'managed' in this respect. Once European nations have been destroyed, their peoples and cultures removed to minority status at the very least, those from other places who have supplanted them will not be able to put up any significant resistance when the time comes to enslave them and destroy their cultures. And once it is no longer useful, Islam will come under attack and go the way of Christianity, while society will continue to be flooded with narcotics, and the 'NWE' family unit will be destroyed in its turn. At that point, there will be no 'WE' people remaining to stand up and fight for the rights of humanity as they might now do, and those who remain, if they are allowed to know anything of this history, will have cause to greatly regret what their predecessors willingly helped to destroy. Ultimately, of course, this serves the fuller Agenda of mass depopulation and totalitarianism.

### Agenda / agenda

While an agenda can refer to an intended outcome or series of outcomes for any purpose, the capitalised 'Agenda' refers to that followed by the FWO, in pursuit of the ultimate Agenda concerning the fate of humanity.

### Narrative / narrative / Storyline

Here, 'narrative' is used in the sense of being 'a story that connects and explains a carefully selected set of supposedly true events, experiences, or the like, intended to support a particular viewpoint or thesis' (Dictionary.com), such as the idea that 'WE' people are inferior to 'NWE' people, and suchlike bigotry. The capitalised 'Narrative', however, is reserved for those distinct issues within the Hollywood ideology which are propagated by a particular product, such that, for instance, we discuss the 'race' Narrative as it is dealt with in a movie, rather than discussing its propagation in wider society, although it is acknowledged that, significantly, these are interdependent, as are Hollywood products, in terms of intertextuality. The storyline, on the other hand, simply refers to what happens in the plot. This word is used in order to distinguish it from the interpretation of 'narrative' as used here.

### lionisation

This can apply to any character except 'WE' males. It is defined as treating someone as a celebrity, as being very important or special, regardless of whether this is deserved. It is used here in opposition to 'demonisation', which is reserved for 'WE' men, only occasionally 'NWE' men, and, more rarely, 'WE' women.

### Hollywood products

This refers to mainstream movies made for a global audience, in what was traditionally intended for viewing in cinemas, but has also come to include 'television' serieses, which have increased in popularity. Here, Hollywood products are not intended to refer to the non-fiction content of 'television'. Furthermore, while 'television' comedy serieses are easily classified as Hollywood products, it is movies which are the subject of this thesis, with much less attention paid to 'television' serieses. Furthermore, because both movies and 'television' serieses are consumed by increasing

numbers of people exclusively on their personal computers, 'tablets' and 'smart' phones, using the internet, the use of the phrase 'television series' is problematic; we remain in a grey area with this until 'television' transmission is entirely internet-mediated.

## Some Propagandisation Methods

The Hollywood propaganda, in the practised hands of those who make it their business, is achieved in many ways, of which the following are among the most intriguing:

### the taxonomy of intersectionality

Although it is widely acknowledged that Hollywood itself, including television and the movies, is a leftist clique which is closed to non-leftist contributors, where only leftist opinions are permitted, we are talking of something even worse than this. The problem is that what theoretically and idealistically begins as protection of disadvantaged citizens, in the real world becomes a matter of granting significant advantages to those who have made it onto the regime-sanctioned list of the 'victims', as having been deemed disadvantaged, and acting to disadvantage as much as possible those who have been deemed advantaged. The results of this are not only material and financial; they also lead, in cultural terms, to extreme lionisation of those deemed privileged, and extreme denigration of those deemed disadvantaged, even though they would be unable to demonstrate an acceptable rationale for this. In managing this illogical system, a very specific set of attributes, which determine whether one is lionised and advantaged, on the one hand, or demonised and disadvantaged, on the other hand, is used, and it is these attributes and system which translate into all the regime-supported products of the culture, which includes all Hollywood products.

Interestingly, these attributes can allow for individuals to be placed on a scale, so that it becomes possible to determine whether an individual is to be more or less lionised, demonised, advantaged or disadvantaged than someone else. Thus, we have the following scale of four basic attributes relating to the two main vectors of gender and race, whereby the rightist ideology states that females are more important than males, and that 'NWE' people are more important than 'WE' people, thus placing 'NWE' females at the top of the scale and 'WE' males at the bottom. In this system, gender also appears to trump race, although a leftist would never stoop to a discussion of such specifics. The other admissible attribute is sexual deviancy, such that homosexuality, as well as transvestitism or transsexuality, is an advantage in whichever category one exists. A homosexual, 'WE' male, for instance, will be less demonised than a heterosexual, 'WE' male. However, what is of most importance here is that lionisation is permissible for all categories except that of heterosexual, 'WE' male; this category alone is selected for maximum demonisation and zero lionisation; there are no exceptions. So much for the leftist ideal of 'equality'. The taxonomy can be summarised as follows, from maximum lionisation and minimum demonisation at the top of the list, to maximum demonisation and minimum lionisation at the bottom:

'NWE' female / homosexual  
'NWE' female  
'WE' female / homosexual  
'WE' female  
'NWE' male / homosexual  
'NWE' male  
'WE' male / homosexual  
'WE' male

All of this is very clear in Hollywood products, where rampant leftism is betrayed through a number of common themes. Furthermore, in terms of centralising power, the propagated narratives also include the CCH, overpopulation (and transhumanism), and deadly disease, which intersect with the overall devaluation of human beings, and the widespread portrayal of death and killing. Also, as a part of the promotion of socialist collectivity and the demonisation of the family, the individual is rarely shown to achieve unqualified success alone, so teamwork is frequently promoted; while heroes are allowed, they will always be shown to need assistance. As mentioned, the overall intention is to generate negativity and depression, while all points finally coalesce in the ultimate Agenda, which goes beyond pharaonic control: the desire to depopulate the planet as quickly as possible, though this is proving difficult to manage or achieve, for many reasons.

Incredibly, as of the time of writing, Hollywood has invested in developing, but not yet making use of, a tool for checking scripts in order to detect any lack of diversity among them. Called 'Spellcheck for Bias', it checks scripts for mentions of 'lgbtq', race and disabilities, as well as for how such issues are portrayed, and will be used by a host of major studios (Leeman, 2020). The hypocrisy of the pretence of checking for bias in scripts is beyond staggering. Being publicised as a mask for excessive biases of sexism and racism in Hollywood products, this tool will merely make a safe count of the numbers of different people depicted, instead of addressing the bigotry which everyone can plainly see. Because this could lead to increases in multi-racial casting and the inclusion of 'lgbtq' and disabled people's roles beyond what audiences could accept, being even more extremely artificial and unreflective of the real world than at present, we might wonder if Hollywood could survive such an onslaught. However, it can be safely predicted that Hollywood is unlikely to follow this to its conclusion because in ostracising most of its audience, it would lose its reach in terms of promoting the denigration and demonisation of 'WE' men, and the division and breakdown of society.

### whitewashing

This is where a contentious issue, such as an event or regime's activity, or the deeds of a person, possibly from history, is simply embedded into a storyline or is made the main premise of one. This amounts to assigning fictional status to issues requiring concealment. It serves, firstly, to allow the issue to be tainted with the association with fiction, the result being that, if it is ever thought about in the real world, there is a temptation to consider that it is a fictitious issue only, and therefore did not happen in the real world. Secondly, once it is part of a story, it can be shaped to suit the narrator's preferences, and mixed in with distractors to diminish its importance. Thirdly, by 'hiding in plain sight', it can be normalised; the audience can consider that it has been dealt with, presumably by mythical sleuths who are truly keen to search out and uncover any mysteries on our behalf - bless their kind souls - and are allowed and funded to do so. Unfortunately, as we know, not only does this allow for the full stories about the 'covered' issues to remain unexplored, but for a massive number of overwhelmingly important issues to go entirely ignored. This has been one of the roles of television 'programming' since its inception, especially in the case of documentaries, which continues today in the deceptive content of the History Channel and the National Geographic channel, for example.

### the Q'uranic principle

This refers to the amount of time and repetition dedicated to an issue. The effect is similar to what happens in those 'religions of the book': besides the cultural programming and societal coercion inherent in religion, making them tragic matters of non-choice in the lives of those who are born into a religion, it also prescribes familiarisation with a 'holy' text. The Christian Bible makes negligible use of repetition in comparison to the Islamic Q'uran, which is also massive in comparison to the Christian book. In the Q'uran, the same few points are repeated ad-infinity, mainly regarding the greatness of that-which-is-God (a truth which is co-opted by ascribing a new name to that which is



God, thus presuming to make that-which-is-God a possession of the religion, and making an in-group of the adherents) and the evil nature and terrible fate of anyone who does not follow this religion. These few points are repeated on practically every page. Consider how long it takes to go through this text, even once, then imagine it to be a daily routine, for life, with the expectation to memorise as much of it as possible, along with the respect gained from others because of one's devotion and piety.

Thus, it is no wonder that belief in the divinity of the book and its contents are absolute among the religion's adherents, not least due to the Rodney King principle: since I have committed myself, I cannot admit that I was wrong or have wasted my time, but must go ahead and pursue the same policy to the end, one of the main psychological reasons why the gang of police officers who viciously assaulted one unarmed citizen with the intention to murder him (Los Angeles, 1991), did not stop their attack after the first strike. Repetition, then, can become self-perpetuating; a mental commitment. Thus, when one is exposed to the same ideas in movie after movie, or, in the case of a television series, episode after episode, they end up affecting one's perception of the world. The 'evil, white male' as an archetype, for instance, is something which many people believe to be real because of what Hollywood products have programmed them to believe. In the case of a series with a continuing storyline, the reiteration also makes use of spoken references, pre-episodic recapitulations, and memory flashbacks, all of which form a mnemonic strategy which allows for the references to become increasingly subtle or indirect, while still allowing for the desired message to be communicated. The familiarity with characters and their past allows for this effect to become not only exponential, but also referenced in increasingly brief amounts of time.

In this respect, we can also consider the use of intertextuality, which has a less than quantifiable effect on the reach of Hollywood propaganda. We should consider this as the repeated reference to the same Narratives and narratives across different products, rather than direct references to specific Hollywood products. The argument would state that a Narrative garners greater authority and penetration through repeated use across different media products, such that an audience will take the narratives to be generally true in the real world. The intertextuality acts as a kind of evidence for this, rather than leaving a Narrative isolated within one or a few products, potentially dismissible and consigned to the world of make-believe.

### Narrative recipe

Although there are a number of favoured Hollywood Narratives, roughly corresponding exclusively to leftist (globalist, satanic, 'liberal', socialist, 'progressive', bigoted, FWO, etc.) ideology, care is taken not to overload any one product with these. The more recent tendency to stack the Narratives, in order to fit as many as possible into the given, precious, propaganda minutes might sometimes appear to strain an audience's credulity and cognitive abilities, but it is apparent that, for each product, no more than two or three main Narratives are selected, with any other narratives being sparse and incidental, although the overarching premise or storyline context can also act as a non-specific or umbrella Narrative. Thus, finding the right recipe ensures that what is propagated can be processed and accepted by the audience; if there were an overload, surely, some of them might start to notice what these products are actually for (!?).

### masking

Narrative recipe notwithstanding, masking refers to Narrative overload, or the overstretch of a particular Narrative within a single product, whereby camouflage, or a 'mask', is provided, which will appear not to align with those Narratives. This allows for a measure of plausible deniability in the minds of the audience, to short-circuit any mental activity regarding understanding what is happening with the programming. This also makes it unlikely that any consensus would be reached if the matter were ever discussed between people. Authentic discussion, academic insight, and

close interpersonal relationships, of course, are all a serious threat to the FWO, since such topics might eventually or accidentally be broached between people in conversation; keeping individuals as isolated as possible, as well as 'dumbed down', is a major weapon in this respect, and the potential for conversation to occur, or to be serious, is much diminished as a result of technology. Masking also assists regardless of whether thoughts are shared, by appearing to render the Narrative less than 100% deployed. An example of masking often comes at the close of a product. For instance, in 'Home', a 'WE' man momentarily appears at the house party in the final scene, as if to disguise the gratuitous absence of 'WE' men in this movie, in which race is a main Narrative; and the brief final moments in 'Bates Motel' show the young couple, Dylan and Emma, happy together with their new baby, as if one of the main Narratives had not been an unrelenting barrage of familial estrangement. Likewise, although the villain would nearly always be a 'WE' man, this is sometimes masked by the inclusion of villainy by a 'WE' woman or a 'NWE' man, although, in such cases, the mask will be qualified with extenuating circumstances or other apologetics. In such cases, and if in doubt, we should be genuinely scientific and revert to considering the weight of numbers.

### tolerance

As discussed by Devon Stack (2019), an audience's tolerance, over the decades, for exposure to the leftist ideology of degeneracy has increased, or, more to the point, been pushed by media to increase, thus allowing for the said, more recent stacking and maximisation of propaganda, making tolerance a diachronic strategy. It also pushes the boundary of all negativity, including violence, and the withdrawal of light relief in between the depravity. Although we might agree that 'we are what we eat', it is hoped that the awareness of what Hollywood was always about, and what the intentions of the products are, can provide some immunity against its effects.

# 1

# Wonder Woman

2017

## the storyline

Viewed through a whole-movie flashback of the protagonist, Diana, from her location in modern-day Paris, where she holds a prestigious position in the Louvre museum, and triggered by the arrival of an old photograph, we witness scenes in her childhood, as the only child of Hippolyta on Themiscyra, the hidden island of the Amazons, a female-only community living in an eternal extension of mythological ancient Greece, where the citizens are very long-lived, as they maintain their old-school, military prowess in readiness to defend humanity when and if the god of war, Ares, returns. Diana has inherent instincts for combat, as well as a heightened sense of justice but her mother has forbidden her to train as a fighter, because of her fear that her aptitude and capacity for fighting could attract the attention of Ares. Her aunt, Antiope, however, coaches her in secret. When Diana's mother discovers this deception, she accepts the inevitable and demands that Diana be trained harder than anyone else, and it is through this experience that Diane begins to discover that she has superhuman abilities applicable to fighting.

One day, during the latter stages of the First World War, of which the Amazons are oblivious, a U.S.A. spy, Captain Steve Trevor, having stolen a notebook detailing plans for lethal gas being developed by the German scientist, Doctor Isabel Maru, and her equally-psychopathic patron, the rogue General Ludendorff, and being pursued in his airplane by German military boats, is shot down and crashes into the sea near the island. This is witnessed by Diana, who sees Steve struggling to free himself from his seat, and starting to drown. She dives into the water, frees him, and brings him onto the shore, but they are pursued by the German army, and a battle ensues on the beach, between the Amazons and the Germans, in which the women prevail, although Antiope is killed. Since Steve is to be kept prisoner indefinitely, and Diana alone understands his story about the Germans and the war to be a sign that Ares is making his move against the world, she escapes with him, taking with her the Amazons' treasured sword, 'the god killer'.

They make their way by boat to London so that Steve can present the notebook to the British War Council and make the case for launching an attack on the gas-production facility in Belgium. This request is refused on the basis of a pending armistice being brokered with Germany, so Steve decides to recruit a few old mercenary acquaintances and undertake the mission in secret, albeit unofficially backed by Sir Patrick Morgan, the quiet-spoken minister representing the government in the War Council, thereby granting Diana her wish to be escorted to where the fighting is thickest, where she believes she will discover Ares. The small band of four, with Diane's powers, manage to make their way into German-occupied Belgian territory, allowing the Allied army to cross no-man's-land in that location, liberating a village, and infiltrating a gala being held by General Ludendorff to celebrate the development and final deployment of the gas bombs, with the first of these being directed at the recently-liberated village nearby, as a demonstration of their efficacy. He has

managed to undertake this against the orders of the German Supreme Army Command because he and Doctor Maru have killed all of them in a bunker using the said gas.

Diana is convinced that Ludendorff is Ares, and since Steve prevents her from killing him at the gala, just before Ludendorff orders the destruction of the village, Diana becomes furious with Steve, and goes in pursuit of Ludendorff alone, catching up with him at the gas-production facility, where a plane is being loaded with gas bombs destined for London. When the four men, following after Diana, arrive at the facility soon after, and discover the bomber, Steve decides he will have to board it and detonate it when it is airborne, presumably in order to minimise its potential for destruction, and ends up doing just that, and dying. Their battle to get him aboard the bomber parallels that of Diana with Ares who, after she has killed Ludendorff and found the war to be continuing nevertheless, momentarily despairs of her belief in the old legend, until she finally discovers her anticipated nemesis, Ares, in the unlikely guise of Sir Patrick Morgan. When he reduces 'the god killer' to dust, the fight is on, during which Ares attempts to lure Diana to his side, explaining that she, in fact, was born a god, and to be the actual god killer. Ultimately, she wins the fight, and the band, minus Steve, return to London and witness the celebration of the Allied victory, a vindication, after all, of Diana's belief in the legend concerning Ares and the Amazons' mission.

## Narrative 1: gender

Even if we are not aware of it while we are watching, it should be understood that the Amazons of legend, whether based on a real community or not, are traditionally misandristic, and the flavour of this understanding underlies the entire premise of the origins of the protagonist in this storyline, presumably intentional even as far back as her first appearance in DC Comics in 1941. Herodotus described the Amazons as 'men killers', for instance, while Homer has them as 'against men', and Aeschylus as 'those who loathe all men'. Meanwhile, the movie's title really tells us all we need to know about its main purpose: the veneration of women, alongside the denigration of men. While this is common to many movies, it reaches a kind of apogee here, as signified by the theme inherent in the title. Almost as if this needed spelling out, we witness a literal battle between men and women on the beach of Themiscyra which, of course, the Amazons win, despite the men enjoying superior weaponry, in a display of apparently unfair odds stacked against the women (by those dastardly men, who also happen to be white, and who also happen to be German). In fact, the beach battle follows very soon after we hear Diana being scolded by Antiope during training: 'You [read: women] expect the battle [read: with men] to be fair! The battle will never be fair!'. This is followed with an additional message for the audience, as she tells Diana, 'You're stronger than you believe. You have greater powers than you know. But, if you don't try harder...', implying that, in this fantastical, skewed reflection of our own world, women really do have untold and superior physical strength, if only they would believe and persist. In terms of the physical and military prowess of women, this superior female strength is displayed from the outset, with the gymnastic feats of the Amazons in training, the ease with which Diana frees Steve after he has been mysteriously unable to do the same for himself, the battle on the beach, where the gun-toting men are dispatched two or three at a time using arrows, swords, spears, knives and fists, and later with Diane's general prowess in two fights with men in London, and in battle in Belgium. On these later occasions, she is also generally shown to be protecting men on her own side from physical harm.

This superiority is displayed in numerous other ways, such as Diana's ability to brave the gas in the Belgian village while Steve is left spluttering and coughing beyond the gas cloud. There is also her moral integrity when set against the lack of such among the men by which she is surrounded in London and Belgium, while the men-free Amazon community is shown to be a utopia, at peace with itself, thriving, sophisticated, and independently self-assured. The implication is that there is no need whatsoever for men. The message is clear and simple: men need women in their lives, but women do not need men in theirs. Besides this, following the arrival of Steve, a male and secondary hero,

who is something of a mask, complete with apologetics, we are subjected to an unsurprising barrage of point-scoring to underline the proposed female superiority in every way in which the storyline might allow. Despite Steve's heroic status and good intentions, he is outshone by Diana's strength, abilities and integrity. Furthermore, Diana's nemesis, Ares, and his avatar, Morgan, are male, as is Ludendorff, a thoroughly repulsive psychopath who kills anyone, even those on his own German staff, without hesitation. In fact, all male characters are shown to be thoroughly flawed, and juxtaposed with Diana's dazzling flawlessness, the males' and Diana's characteristics are mutually augmented. For instance, her impeccable and laudable nature, comprising the entire spectrum of desirable attributes, is amusingly illustrated during a short moment in a London street with Steve, as, immediately after asking him seriously what clothes the local women wear into battle, she sees an infant in a pushchair across the street, and, changing her mood and focus in an instant, delightedly exclaims, 'A baby!' and, lurching towards it, has to be restrained by Steve.

And then, there are Steve's three mercenary friends, who appear only to be interested in worldly gain, making money selfishly for themselves alone. They are also generally emasculated by less-than-military traits, as the diminutive Samir confesses his thespian ambitions and we are witness to Charlie's love of singing. Samir is also shown to be prone to materialist seduction, as he states, in the bar in London, 'Even in Africa, Gentlemen, we haven't seen such luxuries', while his lasciviousness is also hinted at more than once, such as when he states, after they witness Diana easily throw a large man across the room, 'I'm both frightened and aroused'. Charlie, besides being a poor fighter, and prone to lose his nerve when the time comes to live up to his reputation as an excellent sniper, thus labelling him as ultimately useless in the heroic quest, not least because he is the white man among Steve's select companions, is also, true to cultural profiling, an alcoholic. His psychological weakness, immature pride, or lack of feeling, as well as an underlying misogyny, is illustrated when, experiencing a nightmare, Diana relieves him by waking him, to which he reacts by snapping at her, 'Get off me, Woman! Stop making a fuss!', while his supposed cowardice and sexism is illustrated by his initial refusal to join Steve: 'I'm not going to get myself killed helping a wee lassie out of a ditch'. Furthermore, as a sniper, he is scolded by Diana for fighting 'without honour', to which his ignoble reply is, 'Who gets paid for honour?' Indeed, this attitude presents a problem for Steve in being able to convince Charlie and Samir to join him on the heroic quest, in order to push the point home, as his pleas to their better nature - 'It's for a great cause, freedom, friendship...' - fall on deaf ears, and they only acquiesce when the promise of payment arises.

After they finally meet up with Chief, in Belgium, Diana expresses her dissatisfaction with Steve's efforts to recruit assistance: 'A liar, a murderer, and now a smuggler. Lovely!' In addition, Steve is shown to be duplicitous at the drop of a hat, albeit for honourable reasons, and upon his capture by the Amazons, it was necessary for them to compel him to speak only the truth by binding him with the lasso of Hestia; as he explains later in response to Diana's question, 'You mean you were lying?', after their meeting with the War Council, 'I'm a spy; that's what I do!' (though in Narrative terms, we would be hearing, 'I'm a man; that's what I do!'). At the gala, he deceives Doctor Maro with practised ease as he invites her to take a drink with him, and flatters her intelligence and presumed ability to understand his sense of poetry. Almost immediately, however, we are reminded, through this woman's eyes, of men's baser nature, as Steve's eye is caught by the infinitely more physically attractive Diana as he is talking, and Doctor Maro knowingly says, 'Now, I see your attention is elsewhere', concluding their conversation with a cynical cackle, true to the stereotype of Hollywood Germans. Ultimately, though, we might be tempted to consider Steve as being easily as moral and courageous as Diana because of his dedication to opposing Germany (although this could be read in today's context as being 'dangerously' nationalistic; oops!), and his self-sacrifice in the bomber. His death was, therefore, necessary, in order to allow Diana to remain supreme by dint of being the survivor of the two. Alongside the general muddying of our tendency to admire Steve overall, this provides the final and literal nail in that particular coffin, though one is also brought to consider whether Steve is really that bright, since he might have easily flown the bomber towards the Atlantic or The Channel, bailed out, and let the cargo all drop quietly into the water.

The point-scoring is also evident when Diana catches Steve stepping naked out of a bath. She studies him quizzically and asks, 'Would you say you're a typical example of your sex?' This is an example of the subjection of men to something like clinical analysis of something less than human, perhaps difficult to understand, with judgement, apparently, being passed based on this man's physical appearance. Steve's response is, 'I am above average', referring to the size of his genitals, presumably, a threadbare idea which apparently continues to be used to try to intimidate men. Such narratives are much more consciously and politically deployed than they used to be, and this otherwise unnecessary part of the scene with Diana and Steve, if reversed, would exist for entirely different reasons: if a man in a Hollywood product is trying to intimidate a woman into explicitly justifying her validity according to the attributes of her body parts, if such a scene exists, this would be in order to portray the man as being a nasty character, whereas in this case, it is done to humiliate and denigrate the man; the woman can never suffer from such an exchange, whichever way it goes.

Furthermore, Steve's being caught in a vulnerable and embarrassing situation, naked in front of a stranger, equates to the 'WE' man caught off guard in the shower during the invasion scene in 'Home' (2015). To judge this correctly, simply consider how the men viewing this scene might feel, then consider reversing the gender roles in this scene and asking yourself if that would remain permissible in contemporary media. There is also the insidious comical edge to this brief moment, which is used to mask the nasty message being imparted, and the result is a commonly-occurring one in Hollywood: non-homosexual 'WE' men are allowed to be genuinely ridiculed, as opposed to being ridiculed for the sake of making another socio-political point. As mentioned, 'WE' men are positioned in a separate class at the bottom of the intersectional taxonomy, according to the prevailing societal-mental illness which this book seeks to highlight, and are deserving only of contempt; as Sami states in an alcoholic toast to the team's success, 'May we never get what we deserve'. Thus, we are repeatedly instructed: they do not need to be accorded any respect, and will never deserve any. The invitation is open and extended.

Within moments, we hear Diana ridiculing Steve regarding his watch, derisively asking, 'You let this little thing tell you what to do?!' and soon after, 'Do you not know?! how to sail?!' These introductory scenes are also host to some overt showing off, as Diana informs Steve, a little arrogantly, 'We speak hundreds of languages. We are the bridge to a greater understanding between all men.' The choice of the word 'men' rather than 'people' here, must also be noted, being a brat-like, almost bullying, display of intellectual superiority over men, which is the purpose of these lines. This message is later reinforced in a room full of ('WE') men, at the War Council, as Diana blithely informs the baffled and bigoted group about the contents of the notebook, written in a coded Arabic Ottoman mixed with Sumerian. And then there is the moment that she wins a polyglottal sparring contest with Samir, when they first meet. Although undoubtedly accomplished, by this time, we might be forgiven for considering that Diana is seriously flawed after all, although not in a way which would invite our sympathy. The superior-female-intellect line is also spun by the existence of Doctor Meru, the evil genius behind the weaponisation of highly lethal gas. No such intelligence is accorded any men in the movie; they are mostly rather brutish. There is the caveat, of course, that Doctor Meru, although nasty, is a woman, but not to worry: her Germanity serves to mask any multitude of presumed virtues.

There are other moments of male deprecation and emasculation strewn across the landscape of this movie, whereby men are shown to be the ridiculous, dangerous, corruptible and antagonistic source of all of humanity's problems, in comparison with perfect female virtue. From the first moment, we are cued by Diana's narration: 'I used to want to save the world [...] worth cherishing in every way. But, the closer you get, the more you see the great darkness simmering within. And, mankind? Mankind is another story altogether'. This is book-ended using a reiteration at the close of the movie, as Diana resumes the narration with these final words: 'We used to want to save the world, to end war and bring peace to mankind, but then I glimpsed the darkness that lives within their minds, and learned that inside every one of them, there will always be both, a choice each must make for themselves, something no hero will ever defeat. And now I know that only love can truly save the world, so I stay, I fight, and I give, for the world I know can be. This is my mission

now, forever'. Similarly, as Hippolyta narrates the largely invented-for-the-movie story of the Amazons, the sentiments of Diana's opening words are reiterated as we hear how 'Ares poisoned men's hearts with jealousy and suspicion. He turned them against one another, and war ravaged the earth. So, the gods created us, the Amazons, to influence men's hearts with love, and restore peace to the earth'. As Diana later clarifies, 'I'm willing to fight for those who cannot fight for themselves', and 'It is our sacred duty to defend the world'. The question is prompted: 'defend' against whom? Presumably, the viewer is not about to entertain the existence of Ares, as Diana did; they are more likely to conclude that, since Diana speaks for women, it is men (and Germans) against whom they would be defending the world, those who are, apparently, congenitally warlike, like the male Ares, and are, furthermore, apparently unable or unwilling to defend mankind against its own, more contemptible half: 'If no-one else will defend the world from Ares [men], then I must'. The implication we are left with is that the Ares problem lives on within the minds of 'mankind', another careful lexical choice. The sentence tells us that, although men have the innate choice of making peace, this has not been achieved, presumably because they are not making that choice. Furthermore, the sentence, 'I used to want to save the world' is very telling: it contains the underlying proposition that the world, after all, may not be worth saving, or that it cannot be saved (from men), and may be an invitation to abandon any remaining pretence of civilisation or culture, and hand it all over, perhaps, to the hermaphroditic gods of the FWO.

In addition, Hippolyta decries the idea of releasing Steve after his capture, considering that there is a great risk of his 'bringing more men to our shores', telling Diana that 'men are easily corrupted', and, as Diana is finally embarking on her quest, warning her, 'Be careful in the world of men, Diana. They do not deserve you'. Indeed, Hippolyta had brought Diana up with the story that she, Hippolyta had sculpted Diana from clay; that although, after Hippolyta's begging, she had been animated by Zeus, she had come into existence without a father; another convenient 'immaculate conception' tale. This attitude is bolstered by another of Hippolyta's statements to Diana: 'You have been my greatest love', the implication being that love for one's male partner, or one's children's father, should he happen to exist, could never compete in importance with that for one's (especially female) children. Marriage is then more explicitly belittled and ridiculed in the conversation between Steve and Diana on the boat after leaving Themiscyra. After Steve has described human marriage vows, Diana asks, 'And do they love each other till death?' He replies, 'Not very often, no'. She asks, 'Then, why do they do it?'. He replies, 'I have no idea'. This has the additional advantage of making Steve look foolish, and not for the last time. This conversation is ended with Diane's statement of finality, as she recounts the received wisdom taught by the Amazons: 'They came to the conclusion that men are essential for procreation, but, when it comes to pleasure, unnecessary'. Incidentally, and despite the narrative that only women can feel compassion for others, before he runs off to sacrifice his life, Steve tells Diana that he loves her. Of course, no example of mutual feeling is permitted; Diana does not reciprocate the statement, having conveniently been temporarily deafened by an explosion; it is no longer permitted under the FWO for women to be shown expressing anything but barely concealed hostility and contempt for men.

In this movie, we are supposed to presume that we are being given a glimpse into a worldview which is supposed to no longer exist, one in which women fulfilled an inferior role. While there may be some validity to this, the promotion of such a hypothesis in the complete absence of real-world context or historical information is nothing if not obscenely gratuitous. For instance, while the German Supreme Army Command contains no females, the members of the Allied War Council are shown to be extremely hostile to a female presence at their meetings, as Steve is reprimanded with the line, 'What the hell were you thinking bringing a woman into the Council Chamber?!' Diana, by now enjoying our full sympathy, had clearly expressed her contempt for these men by her outburst there, accusing them, in so many words, of malicious elitism and cowardice, and telling them that they should be ashamed. This fury is soon after directed at Steve as she scolds him for acquiescing to their orders, accusing him, too, of cowardice. The presentation of this ideology of female inferiority is underscored by the presence of Steve's secretary, Etta, who, though gifted with organisational skills, would never normally be granted the opportunity to take on a role with responsibilities, and is therefore speechless when asked to oversee Steve's mission. In this part of the storyline, we are

reminded of what we are supposed to believe in terms of the past, and, by extension, present treatment of women, as Etta describes the role of a secretary to Diana. As if Steve were a lazy and incompetent bully, and she were infinitely more capable than he, she says, 'I do everything. I go where he tells me to go, and I do what he tells me to do.' To make the point explicit, Diana retorts, 'Where I'm from, that's called slavery.' Such disenfranchisement is also highlighted in another off-the-cuff (as if) remark coming from Etta, as she takes an opportunity to mention the (fictitious, engineered and publicised) 'struggle' for women to be allowed to vote in 'democratic' elections. When Diana asks about women fighting, Etta says, 'We use our principles. I mean, that's how we're going to get the vote, although I am not opposed to engaging in a bit of fisticuffs should the occasion arise.' Her comment, although understated, underlines the presumed absence of male integrity, as well as being an invitation to women to engage in physical battle against men and their perceived 'oppression'. Meanwhile, in case we need a reminder about the development of suffrage in the real world Britain of that time, and in case we give any credence to the notion that that entails any kind of democratic validity anyway, men were prevented from voting until 1918, and they were granted that 'right' at the same moment that women were. The one difference is that this applied only to women over the age of thirty, while the age restriction was lowered to match that of men only ten years later. As a result, the only difference is the age difference during those ten years; so much for the 'patriarchy' and the overbearing attention given to the history of women's fighting for the 'right to vote'.

In order to emphasise men's cruelty, or at least heartlessness, in Belgium we are shown soldiers beating a horse to try to get a cart pulled out of some very slippery mud, and nobody taking any notice of this treatment. Of course, Diana is on the scene to illustrate their depravity, especially when juxtaposed with her own impeccable conscience, as she asks, 'Those animals: why are they hurting them?' Her plea goes unheeded, of course. And in the same scene, when she points out a badly wounded soldier, it falls to Sami to fatalistically point out, 'There is nothing you can do about it, Diana.' The message is that men would tend to ignore, or give up on the idea of relieving, the suffering of others. Later, after the gas attack on the village, we have a lingering shot of Diana there, despairing at the carnage in every direction. Returning to Steve, she furiously scolds him because, somehow, it is his fault, rather than Ludendorff's: 'They're all dead [...]. I could have saved them if it weren't for you; You stopped me from killing Ares.' At this point, we are treated to a further iteration of the underlying theme with which the storyline is both bookended and liberally peppered, as Diana screams at Steve to stay away from her. On our behalf, she articulates her latest insight concerning 'the world of men': 'I understand everything now. It isn't just the Germans that Ares has corrupted; it's you, too; all of you!' This is the precursor to the great revelation during the anticipated confrontation with Ares, soon after. Diana then reminds us of Hippolyta's warning: 'My mother was right. She said the world of men do not deserve you. They don't deserve our help, Steve.' Finally confirming the main overarching narrative from the man's viewpoint, acquiescing to the 'wisdom' of this, Steve's response is, 'You don't think I wish I could tell you that it was one bad guy to blame? It's not; we're all to blame', to which Diana replies, on behalf, of course, of all women, 'I'm not'.

Of course, there is also the mentioning of the innocents in all this, those victims of the patriarchy and the wars they generate, which is used media-wide to invite and augment the censure of supposed offenders. The victims of war, logically, therefore, are nearly always of the 'women-and-children' variety, since men cannot, apparently, be victims. Here, we have Steve, after his capture by the Amazons, explaining the war to them: 'innocent people - women and children slaughtered, their villages and homes looted and burned'. And when our heroes first arrival at the battle scene in Belgium, we are faced with the classic image of a woman running with an infant in her arms, while we also suffer the sounds of another crying infant and a boy shouting repeatedly for his mother. Soon after, Diana exclaims, 'They were killing each other, killing people they cannot see; children!; children!', and 'We cannot leave without helping them. These people are dying... women, children', to which Steve, in the role of unsympathetic male, replies, 'We can't save everyone in this war'.

A little after this, we receive the great revelation from the horse's mouth, in support of Diana's insight, as she finally does battle with Ares, complete with arch-villainous monologue. Firstly, we are treated



to another lesson in male duplicity, as we discover that Ares is actually the mild-mannered and apparently upstanding Sir Patrick, from the Council Chamber, as he confesses, 'I am not what you thought I was'. Masquerading as honour and respectability, this trumps even Ludendorff's more overt form of evil. In this, we are also supposed to understand that the ubiquitous evil within men may be well-hidden; appearances will deceive, so no man is trustworthy. Instructing Diana with his divine knowledge, he proceeds to confirm that mankind (read: men) 'only deserve destruction', that 'they have always been, and always will be, weak, cruel, selfish, and capable of the greatest horrors', and again, that 'they are ugly, filled with hatred, weak', then, echoing her mother's understanding, he also tells her that mankind (read: men) does not deserve her protection. Enlightening her beyond her current beliefs, he proceeds to tell her, 'I am not the god of war, Diana; I am the god of truth', as we finally encounter the fully exposed Narrative, that mankind (man) is inherently evil, and that there is no outside agent augmenting or directing their evil, so they are entirely to blame for all of the ills of the world. Whether or not we accept Ares's version of the truth, the monologue goes unchallenged by Diana for some time, and we are further exposed to man's list of crimes, beginning with thievery, as Ares states that 'mankind stole this world from us', and proceeding to mention their extreme neglect and immaturity. As he states that 'they ruined it day by day', we are shown the land scorched, dead, with smouldering tree stumps, which allows for the intertextuality with other widespread false narratives: humanity's alleged wanton destruction of our planet and the CCH. Yes, if only humanity (read: men) was removed altogether, 'We could finally end all the pain, all the suffering, the destruction they bring', as we are shown the earth becoming green and fertile again.

In explaining that he has never forced people (read: men) to use the weapons he has inspired them to develop, in his effort to get them to destroy themselves, Ares adds that 'they start these wars on their own'. This seems to echo Ludendorff's sentiments when, rather relishing the idea of war, he had stated that 'war gives man purpose, meaning, a chance to rise above his petty, mortal little self, and be courageous, normal, better.' What is intriguing about this is that Ares is explicitly outlining FWO (Archontic) globalist narratives: the inevitability of war, the destruction of the planet by people, and the desirability of destroying humanity. Although it is true, of course, that evil is perpetrated by people entirely of their own volition, and that humanity, via the planet, have been poorly treated, the difference between this speech and reality is that, in the storyline, Ares applies this trait to all men, whereas in the real world, this is applicable to only a ridiculously tiny minority of individuals, and their puppets, of both genders. Thus, we come face to face with the main objective of the theme in short: the blame for the most terrible aspects of the way the world has been run is being shifted from the perennial, satanic minority onto humanity, or men, as a whole, thus victimising them twice over, and conveniently providing support for the absurd notion that there is, after all, no perennial, satanic, Ares-like force for evil running the planet as their private fiefdom and corporation. We are then returned to our less abstract, gender narrative, as the battle is concluded: the ultimate woman shows that she can be forgiving of even the worst of human beings, as we are shown Doctor Meru deserving, in the final analysis, of being spared, presumably because she is female, since Ludendorff enjoyed no such consideration, after which Diana destroys the ultimate evil [male], saying 'Goodbye, Brother'. This is neatly done, since Diana absorbs the energy which Ares throws at her, and throws it straight back at him, providing the final statement: that, all other things being equal, since they are both gods, and of the same parentage (Zeus), the female is the greater.

## Narrative 2: World War Two (World War One)

The wartime setting is that of the First World War, but this is supposed to intertextually trigger us to reference an identical Second World War setting, and, in terms of the movie, this might not have looked much different, except that we would be getting plenty of anti-Nazi propaganda. There could be any number of reasons why the first war was selected, and our guesses about the reasons why could include the opportunity to showcase the supposedly higher levels of obvious male bigotry towards women at that time. There is other potential, however, such as the possibility of the trench

warfare scene, with Diana crossing no-man's-land against a hail of bullets. Meanwhile, the featuring of Belgium supports one of the ongoing lies about the causes of that war, which was entirely orchestrated by a London clique, making use of French and Russian collaborators, lies, and the controlled media. Also, if the second war had been selected, it would have been difficult to avoid the inclusion of the lionised warmongering British Prime Minister during the second war, while the more obvious, narrowly-focussed, target would have been Hitler. All of this could have detracted from the main theme, while men in general can more easily be denigrated in the vague fiction of Ludendorff. As it is, though, there are another couple of more obvious expedient elements which allow us to make a strong connection between those wars, namely: Paris, the (dastardly) Germans of course, and the alleged German weaponisation of gas, allowing for an arguably-powerful referencing of the Jewish and 'holocaust' issues, although this remains oblique and implicit for the reason that these, too, would not support the movie's main Narrative of gender; nothing can be allowed to detract too much from this focus. As such, the one telling line, from Steve, 'Those are the bad guys: the Germans', although explicit, remains short and sweet.

Paris is significant because of its iconic status as the archetypal Nazi-occupied city, and the scene of ultimate liberation following the Allied victory, practically still within living memory at the time of the movie's production. When Paris is portrayed in such a context, we are supposed to reference the evil oppression of liberty across the entire world, the smothering of free expression, and of all noble human passion, with Paris the epicentre of stirring, die-hard resistance to evil tyranny. In this case, whereas France is not featured in the main, flashback storyline, Paris fleetingly provides the setting for Diana's life today. We are also subliminally provided with the reference to Freemasonry, Paris being the point of origin for that particularly effectual secretive society, and one of the few cities where it is most explicitly paraded, in its architecture, monuments, and road layout. In this case, we are presented with an explicit view of the Louvre pyramid at the start, and the Eiffel Tower at the end. It is the contention here that this is clearly intended to signify Freemasonic involvement in the start of those wars, and, through the lineage of the society, the management of all major historical or political development since pharaonic times. Although this is a statement easily misinterpreted, we will not digress here into explication of how such involvement is achieved, but suffice to say that Freemasonry works as part of a nexus of such covert interests, which includes the banking and financial sector, that such interests have been the instigators of practically all significant wars and revolutions in our age, including the French, the Russian, and the north American, and that Britain, be it through government or secret government, as a part of this diabolical nexus, is particularly culpable in relation to the instigation of the two wars mentioned here.

When it comes to referencing these wars, the audience is forced to fall back on what it thinks it knows about them, and most of that 'information' is guaranteed to be false, not least because what most people have been informed about those wars comes entirely from Hollywood itself; needless to say, the grand Hollywood war narrative of the Second World War, dominating all others in the mind of 'western' citizenry, is bogus. The purpose of this is to provide, much like Hollywood itself does, the bogeyman of our age, in the form of the evil German, which in our own time, has been surpassed by the evil Russian and the extremist Muslim. Bogeymanism serves to support the propagation of wars as well as the justification of previous wars and their mainstreamed attendant narratives, and to generally obscure and divert attention from the ongoing crimes and nefarious activities of the FWO, as well as our general enslavement and terrorisation, physically, mentally and spiritually. Like surface-politics in the real world, it serves to keep the citizenry's mind locked into those surface perceptions, believing that publicised events in the world, whether staged or actual, are the result of the actions of very identifiable, visible people. The citizenry are locked into this perception cycle like the rolling 'news' of a 24/7 television 'news' network: perpetually; from cradle to grave. And, yes, 'The Matrix' is easily invoked here.

Of course, the whole 'Germans: bad' thing, in which they need to be portrayed as being as depraved and evil as possible, then as now, is directly linked to the oppression of the European Jews of that time, and it should be mentioned that, while much of this oppression is a matter of historical supposition with which it is easy to concur, despite not witnessing any of it first-hand, there is plenty

of information missing or misrepresented regarding the experiences of the European Jews, as well as the Germans and Germany, before and during the second war, not to mention the same in terms of managing the cover-up of the lies and what was done in the aftermath following its end. As a result, and just as planned, this evolved narrative has served as an expedient way to counteract inconvenient untrammelled thinking and expression, and as a way to demonise 'WE' culture and people, softening them up for the final assault, which at street level, has truly come of age in the guise of identity politics. First, there were Jews and non-Jews, a meme which was gently paraded as 'victims and oppressors'. This more lately became 'oppressors = 'WE' people', and 'victims = everybody else'. The Jewish Question, rooted, for generations subsequent to the 1940s, in that narrative, has served to support the overarching (or underlying) narrative of oppressed 'minorities', as both this and the Jewish narrative have been increasingly weaponised over those decades in the march, ironically, towards global, fascist totalitarianism, and this is a truly postmodernist idiom not least because the narrative is deployed in order to overtly oppress, at least for now, only those labelled as the oppressors. In this, we can get a sense of why control of all media, and of these perverted or false narratives, is a priority for the FWO, and how those media would not exist at all if they were not serving the overall Agenda. And this cannot be overstated: the current socio-political insanity we are liable to witness at any turn nowadays depends partly on the former establishment and subsequent and ongoing perpetuation of the grand narrative of the Second World War. In the characters of Diana and Steve, this is being acknowledged by the Hollywood zionists, as we are reminded, once again, that this is all still very much with us.

And if we are tempted to stray from the 'Germans: bad' narrative, suspecting, perhaps, this to be the fatuous propaganda it is, we are provided with the supernatural explanation that somehow they have been possessed by the god of war, even as if Britain and the bankers had not started those wars. This is shown by the actual possession of the British minister, Sir Patrick Morgan, by Ares, and the supernatural power provided to General Ludendorff by a type of gas invented for him by Doctor Meru, but also stated by Diana: 'Once I find and destroy Ares, the German armies will be freed from his influence, and they will be good men again and the world will be better'. There is an interesting 'reveal' here, in the person of Sir Patrick Morgan, representing the British government, as the god of war, which is painfully close to the truth of the matter, a fact well-concealed in plain sight, and a neat illustration of the FWO need to declare their plans and actions in order to better facilitate them by way of satanic magic.

Other 'Germans: bad' indicators include the physical hideousness which Doctor Meru's mask both reveals and implies, a truly infantile gesture worthy of the most primitive storytelling, as with the invented hunched back of King Richard the Third, and we are invited to support nicknaming her 'Doctor Poison' because it is what 'the boys in the trenches called her [...]. And for good reason'. When the lethal gas has finally been developed, at General Ludendorff's command, Doctor Meru throws some gas cannisters into the German Supreme Army Command meeting room, which is now transformed into a gas chamber, killing those on their own team. They both laugh as the officers die, while General Ludendorff takes a well-earned hit from his own, personalised gas drug. Again, Doctor Meru can be shown to be a psychopathic killer, this time up close to her victims, because she is German. There is also the presumed German subjection of non-Germans (Turkish) people, including children, working in the munitions depot. And then there is the incident of the German woman whose clothes are stolen by Diana, in this case making that lady out to be a buffoon. Notably, German men cannot easily be portrayed as buffoons in such a movie, since it would interfere with their portrayal as congenitally psychopathic monsters.

Regarding the matter of the gas itself, this is, as mentioned, a powerful signifier of the presumed existence of the concentration camps as death camps, in which, according to the FWO narratives, Jewish people were targeted for genocide, and many killed using gas inside gas chambers. The discussion regarding the veracity or otherwise of this narrative can be found elsewhere, but for our purposes, the development of gas, by Germans, the out-group, as a lethal weapon to be used on the in-group, serves the general narrative of 'Germans: bad' / 'non-Germans: victims', in order to reference that key feature of World War Two, and then the development of that narrative since that

time. So potent has the very word 'gas', in such contexts, been rendered by FWO propagandists that it has continued to be wielded ever-more effectively, contributing in no small way to more contemporary FWO warmongering for the usual business purposes and ultimate ends, as we have seen in claims of 'gas' being used in Iraq and Syria, often synonymous with the epithet 'WMD', in order to justify, for the globally-sheeped citizenry, the destruction of those countries and the slaughter of the people of those countries. Strangely, there is a pretence propagated that there are weapons which are beyond moral bounds, with the implication that those producing such propaganda find the use of particular weapons reprehensible and would never stoop so low, a hyper-ironic, holier-than-thou stance which clearly stems from the postwar demonisation of lethal gas. Incidentally, it might also be argued that the label 'gas' was selected for deployment throughout the CCH, whereby the FWO actually have many people believing that carbon dioxide is harmful, trying to fudge the obvious use of the word 'gas' by burying it in the phrase 'greenhouse gases', even though the focus is exclusively on carbon dioxide; you know: that food without which plants cannot produce the oxygen without which we all die.

In the movie, we are supposed to associate the development of these weapons with cruel intent, as we are shown Doctor Meru and General Ludendorff using lethal gas experimentally on a prisoner and on a gas mask, with the suggestive power of the latter proving the more visually and psychologically effective. Incidentally, the gas used on the prisoner does not kill him, at which Doctor Meru is shown to be furiously regretful. The evil apparently possessing, or natural to, General Ludendorff is shown to be common to the whole tribe as we witness the gala's German guests cheering as the newly-developed gas is fired experimentally into a local village, killing all the inhabitants for no apparent reason. We are introduced to this idea early on, when Steve reveals the situation to the Amazons, when he tells them, as if such a thing were beyond reasonable expectations in wartime, that the Germans were developing 'not just bombs. new weapons. secret weapons, weapons far deadlier than you can ever imagine,' shocking them with the statement, 'It's like nothing I've ever seen. It's like the world's going to end.' Later, he tells The British war Council, regarding the gas 'if it is used, it will kill everyone on both sides; they will all die'.

## Narrative 3: race

Although less overt and more incidental, the race Narrative makes its presence felt throughout the movie, which can subtly or indirectly reference related narratives such as immigration, or a presumed German concern with race, introduced by way of referencing the world wars in Europe, and thus a concomitantly presumed genocidal slaughter of European Jews. Indeed, even referencing Germany in this way automatically triggers racial messages, including even differences between racial sub-groups, such as the differences between Germans and other Europeans with the same ancestry.

From the outset, we are presented with an accented protagonist; although Wonder Woman has always, so far, been portrayed as a 'WE' woman, a small step is taken here to make her a non-native speaker of English. This works well for the story, of course, resolving the matter of her origins, but such expediency does not negate propaganda, and can still be counted among the Narrative arsenal; once in Europe, she is an outsider. Meanwhile, inside the Amazon community, we do not find ourselves among a homogenous population, but a cosmopolitan one. This works much less well for the story, since we are told that these women are long-lived, meaning that there would have been little need for procreation throughout their history, so any expediency begins to look less tenable, while the image serves the immigration narrative, as if a highly diverse community were a natural state for humanity. Again, to state the obvious, while this might be a laudable ideal, people have not, without its being a matter of survival, imposed themselves on other peoples and homelands outside of military invasions, while other, lesser migration has always, naturally, remained minimal, with immigrants forming small minorities within a population.

Early on, while the tribe's origins are being described, in service of the demonisation of men, Diana is being told, 'the Amazon queen led a revolt that freed us all from enslavement, while we are shown an image of Amazons captured by male soldiers. Three of them are being led, but the one at the front is a 'NWE' woman, and is the only one being led on a leash fastened to her neck. This is clearly intended to serve the race Narrative, as well as the related narrative concerning the history of slavery, as far as that goes, in North America. Unfortunately for some, this history is nothing like as black and white, to coin an apt phrase, as they would like, and is as facile as any of the other infantile excuses for knowledge which they relish repeating. What should also be noted is the way that such narratives can be referenced subtly; the message is almost subliminal, being fleeting, and such a tactic is perpetuated throughout all Hollywood product, being one of the proofs that none of this is accidental or the work of uninitiated scriptwriters.

When we are introduced to Steve's three team members, as mentioned, they are all, being men, portrayed as very flawed. They are also as diverse as might be reasonable to expect in such small numbers and in such a context: Sami is an Arab, and Chief is native American, and both of them are presumably refugees, feeding the agenda point of weaponised immigration. In service to this, the false narrative of a refugee crisis is invoked, although the cause is revealing: when Diana, upbraiding Chief for being concerned only with profits, asks why he is in a war where he does not take a side, he replies, 'I have nowhere else. The last war took everything from my people. We have nothing left. At least here, I'm free'. 'Who took that from your people?' she asks. 'His people', comes the reply, as Chief indicates Steve. The point is that the government of the country that Steve comes from, however illegitimate, has created circumstances too difficult for indigenous people to endure, causing them to move away, just as in the case of present-day warmongering instigated by that same governing body. While this looks to be true, what needs to be remembered is that creating such a crisis is a large part of the reason why such circumstances are created. We should also remember that we are all dispossessed, disenfranchised and enslaved, regardless of any persistent illusions to the contrary, and that this is achieved by withholding truth, manipulating information, and outright lying; we are all victims, and we have never given our consent for any such activity. Furthermore, popular support for such evil would be much more difficult to gain without such industrialised mendacity, which is why we many of us spend time with books like this one. The same narrative is invoked in the imagery of dejected soldiers and genuine refugees, as our heroes leave England and enter Belgium. The refugees are shown to be filthy and desperate, trudging hopelessly through muddy wastes, inviting our sympathy. Our one encounter with the refugees is when Diana exchanges a few words with a woman in an army trench in Belgium, with the translation being, 'They've taken everything [...]. The one's who couldn't escape, they took as slaves', again neatly referencing the slavery narrative, possibly indicating that more outrage can be elicited by this than if she had said they were killed.

Sami is given a line to reinforce the idea that non-indigenous people are disadvantaged in their chosen home, and that, as a result of infantile prejudice, they cannot realise their potential, even as if this were not at least as much the case for those indigenous people. He tells Diana and us, 'Not everyone gets to be what they want to be, all the time; me: I am an actor. I love acting. I didn't want to be a soldier. I'm the wrong colour'. We can also refer to Andy again, who, being somewhat indigenous, Scottish, is the least honourable. As mentioned, he is an alcoholic, ultimately fails in his professed ability as a sniper, and of the three mercenaries, is given the job of closed-minded cynic in response to Steve's revelation about Diana's origins, saying, 'Don't be daft!', and, 'Steven, Son, you don't really believe this rubbish, do you?'. Of course, this has the additional benefit of reinforcing such attitudes among the audience, whenever they encounter information which most would dismiss on the basis of 'science' and (uninformed) majority consensus. In this case, since we know that what Steve has told them about Diana is true, we feel the insult, and might rather hold Andy in contempt for such an attitude, thereby revealing why he, rather than either of the other two, was chosen to deliver this line. Furthermore, despite all he has witnessed, Steve also has his doubts about Diana's beliefs about her origins; strike two. Meanwhile, neither Chief nor Sami comment on this matter.

Similarly, the other noticeable feature is what might be termed 'black pepper', which is generally thrown about in England during Diana's time there with Steve. There are different races of people in the streets and in the train station, much more evidently than would have been the case is that time. Of course, many people from the British empire were enlisted in the armed forces in those wars, so this, as with the fleeting background presence of a female bus conductor, looks to be evidence of sound research and attention to accurate historical detail, but we should bear in mind what we have said about expediency. As such, this is also a good way to reference the actuality of the British empire, and thereby all the terrible things it is supposed to represent.

## Narrative: other

Another point it might be worthwhile remembering, since it is a common feature in fiction generally, and often enlisted as a Narrative, that the overcoming of evil, the winning of the battles, regardless of Diana's supernatural powers, is supposed to have been achieved by a team of people, rather than any one individual. This is a very apparent departure from the older movie tradition of lone heroes, the John Waynes and the James Bonds. Even super hero movies now enlist the protagonist as part of a group, with the expedient precursors, presumably originated in all innocence, of groups such as the Avengers, the fantastic Four, and the X-Men, even though any one of these heroes would normally be quite able to beat the bad guys on their own, just as they invariably did in the graphic fiction - Spider Man, Iron Man, and Daredevil, for example - of the past. Nowadays, stories are scripted to provide an excuse for more interdependence, and the stories show how beating the bad guys could not be achieved except as a group. The Amazonian tribe is a key motif in this particular case, and serves the narrative regarding the intended move towards, or maintenance of, socialism and covert fascism. In many walks of life, the positive attributes of the group, and what they can achieve as a result of teamwork, is headlined, while there is little media celebration of the power of the individual. The intention is, by such indirect entrainment, as far as this can be achieved, to discourage thinking for oneself, trusting one's instincts and judgement, and valuing oneself as an autonomous being with individual rights of expression and liberty, in order to reinforce groupthink and a fear of departing from the 'opinions' or 'received wisdom' of the collective. It is a higher order narrative which needs to be kept on the boil since it underpins the execution of so many other nefarious aspects of the FWO agenda, which relies on general consensus regarding its propaganda; hence, the ongoing, very real battles against freedom of expression where opinions depart from those programmed into the majority. By way of illustration, in the village after Diana has defeated the occupying German forces, Steve tells Diana, 'You did this', to which she replies, 'We did'. Her statement is generally supported by the involvement of Steve and the others, who also contribute to the interception of the bomber.

The other benefit provided by the teamwork narrative, ironically, is that of the negation of the family unit, in which membership of a family is either accorded no value, or is cited as a serious disadvantage, alongside the idea that the people in one's life, with whom one bonds, achieves, and is fulfilled, can very easily be strangers one meets along the way. Mutual trust, mutual dependability, and mutual love are portrayed as being unachievable within the family unit, while all accessible within non-family units. The message is clear: family members will hold you back; friends will fulfil, support and entertain you. This is an example of an exemplary human trait being used against us, since we are social beings with a need to discover and rely upon these attributes in a community. If we are removed from family, we are bound to look for these among friends, and, maybe this would not be such a tragedy if it were true that we could consider all of humanity as equally interested and invested in our thriving as family members would be. But this will never be the case; people are naturally self-interested and invested only in their in-groups; borders are necessary for everyone's protection, however unfortunate an indictment of human nature this might be, and it is impossible for our predispositions to be changed by removing borders and living in communes under a single global government. While recalling how monogamy is ridiculed by Diana, in that subsequent

discussion after the liberation of the village, as Steve describes what people do with their time in normal life, she asks Steve, 'What is it like?', to which he replies, 'I have no idea'. Besides the general absence of familial role models in this or any other movies, it is worth remembering the main narratives and purposes of this one, since here are our two heroes in the spotlight demonstrating, in their mature equanimity, strength and fortitude, an absence of any need or desire for familial ties. Of course, this is part of the reason why Steve needs to be disposed of, since their coupling would represent a reversion to nature's unequivocality; boy meets girl, and this means family. So, we have to be left hanging with the most cursory of flirting, and no development of the relationship beyond Diana's good-cop-bad-cop attitude towards Steve. And, as far as we are told, in her life beyond the war, despite never ageing, Diana remains unattached, and will probably do so into eternity.

In a final acknowledgement of the main Narrative, the moments following Diana's battle with Ares distill ugly ambition into a scene of biblical majesty as we are presented with a carefully constructed tableau of Diana standing silently triumphant at centre-stage with the sun rising directly behind her, with exactly twelve storm-weary and drably-attired men staggering or on their knees on either side of her, facing in her general direction. We might interpret this as, perhaps, the movie's ultimate message, even as if it were not long since obvious: that the woman, in this case a Wonder[ful], Wonder[ous] Woman, is a weapon, perhaps the acknowledged 'god-killer', this being the man-killer within the imagined patriarchy within which man, in that fantasy, reigns supreme, which has been unleashed on the world of men; for all the talk of weapons and enemies, we are back to the headline, whereby Diana is herself the weapon, wielded by the producers against the one specified enemy - man - and can neither be vanquished nor resisted.

# 2

# Home

2015

## the storyline

In the present day, Earth is invaded by the entire race of the Boov, who are on the run from the Gorg, who are always hunting them down to attack them. In their quest to find a new, safe place to settle, the Boov inhabit human cities while relocating all humans to a new settlement in Australia, and removing cultural structures and all manufactured objects which are not useful to them, by levitating them above the cities. The story is told through the two characters of a young human girl, Gratuity Tucci, and a fugitive Boov, Oh, who is wanted for arrest by the rest of the Boov for endangering them in their new home by sending an email - an invitation to a housewarming party - to the whole galaxy by mistake, an email which will attract the attention of the Gorg.

After escaping capture and transportation in New York City, Gratuity sets out to find her mother, and immediately meets up with Oh, who, being keen to escape arrest, promises to help her in her quest. This is achieved by transforming her car into one which flies, and setting off for Paris, Boov headquarters, where Oh will be able to use the Boov technology to locate Gratuity's mother. On the way to Paris, they become more understanding of each other, learning about the different natures of their respective species.

In Paris, Oh discovers that, contrary to his expectation, his email has not yet been cancelled, but he and Gratuity manage to infiltrate the Boov headquarters on the now-floating Eiffel Tower, and to cancel the email just before it reaches the Gorg. Oh then checks the computer to locate Gratuity's mother in Australia. This is followed by a hurried escape from the rest of the Boov, who are still intent on punishing Oh for his mistakes. When Oh and Gratuity reach Australia, in their flying car, they find that all Boov staff located there are evacuating the planet on their ship, because the Gorg, despite Oh's cancellation of his email, are on their way to Earth. The flying car is attacked by Gorg drones, and crashes, after which Gratuity and Oh retrieve a Gorg 'super chip', an advanced energy device, from a crashed Gorg drone. Following this, having to decide between running away, which is a natural disposition of all Boov, and remaining with Gratuity to finish helping her find her mother, Oh makes the difficult but logical decision, and runs to board the final Boov ship, leaving Gratuity alone to find her mother amidst the gathering chaos as the Gorg mothership approaches and lands nearby.

The escaping Boov ship is attacked by the Gorg, with chaos also ensuing on board their ship, but they are saved when Oh inserts the Gorg super chip into their own power supply and they are able to race beyond the reach of the Gorg's weaponry. This brings all Boov attention to Oh and, while their leader, Captain Smek, denounces him to save face, the rest of the Boov, in celebratory mood, install Oh as their leader in Smek's place. As a token of this leadership, he receives Smek's stick, 'the shusher', which Smek had occasionally used to hit others.



On the ground, amidst the people's celebration at the Boov departure, Gratuity is in despair, having been unable to locate her mother. Meanwhile, Oh, thinking better of his decision to leave, returns to resume their friendship and help find her mother, which is achieved. The planet remains in danger, however, because the massive Gorg ship on the ground by Happy Humanstown has embarked on the destruction of the planet. Oh then discovers a small rock in the end of the shusher, which had previously been stolen from the Gorg by Smek. Opening it, he finds that it contains Gorg seed, and realises that this is what had led Gorg to pursue the Boov, as well as to track them to Earth. He races to return this to the Gorg before the destruction of Earth can get underway, and manages to attract the Gorg ship's pilot's attention with Gratuity's help. When Oh meets the Gorg pilot, he learns that the seed represented the entire next generation of the Gorg, and that the pilot was the last remaining Gorg of the present generation, and had been desperately chasing the Boov to prevent the extinction of his species. In the end, the Gorg pilot leaves happily with the rock, and the human population settles back into normal life, with the addition of the entire Boov population alongside them. We end with a house party back in Gratuity's New York City apartment, where both humans and Boov are present.

## Narrative 1: race (immigration)

In this movie, we are being confounded by the mixing of various attributes, of the Boov and of humans, on the one hand, and of 'WE' people in their countries, and recent immigrants to 'WE' countries, on the other. This intended conflation of victims and victors may be clarified a little if we first consider the differences between invasion, immigration and colonisation, all of which are featured or suggested here.

Earth basically represents a country, which is being invaded. On the face of it, the invaders and their actions are supposed to represent immigrants to 'WE' countries, which is portrayed from the outset in their idiosyncratic use of English, with such entertaining phrases as, 'I am very excitement to make a new, fresh start', 'Rejoice, Humanspeople; the Boov are arrived', and 'You are arresting' (under arrest). Although they are invaders, therefore, we are encouraged to empathise very strongly with the Boov invaders, through the personable character of Oh, and their predicament of, apparently, having no place to call home; they live on a spaceship and appear to have no home planet. This perspective is paralleled in the real world, where the pretense that immigrants are relocating because they have no choice is maintained by the mainstream propaganda network, achieving this, in fact, by refusing to discuss the issue. The only time this is allowed to be referenced is to propagate the idea that this population displacement revolves around civil war or internecine strife which is usually, anyway, itself engineered by the FWO as part of their business interests, which include, in the longer term, the ever-increasing ownership of all resources and assets, and the ultimate culling of the herd.

The invader aspect of the Boov is supported by their representing 'WE' people, despite their various colorations, because their voices are provided by 'WE' actors. This allows for an indirect demonisation of 'WE' people, especially since they are juxtaposed with the 'NWE' persons of Gratuity and her mother. This characterisation is also supported by the extension of invasion into colonisation, a more permanent theft and settlement, which is the Boov's intention and the eventual outcome. More to the point, Australia is featured, as the location of Happy Humanstown, to which all humans are relocated, which allows for the invocation of the historical colonising adventures of Britain.

Colonisation is not stated by any means in this movie, and not everyone will be affected by its memetic influence, but, as with so many other such memes, all that is needed for this latter point to gain traction is the mention of the word Australia, coupled with an image of obvious injustice

perpetrated against a whole population of people. As if to reinforce this point, the Gorg also lands its mothership in Australia, in order to begin destroying the planet in a fit of spite, starting with Australia itself. Again, in the actions of the Gorg, we are encouraged to reference Australia as having been destroyed by those British invaders, with the extended implication that such behaviour, and by extension the behavior, in general, of 'WE' people, is ultimately a threat to the welfare of the planet itself.

Despite the storyline being unrelated to that history, the suggestion is left to hang on the air nevertheless, and we are invited to be quietly reminded that the British regime, in the name of business, with the support of their military and the ever-reprehensible exploitation of British 'citizens' (chattel), rampaged around the world stealing territory and subjugating humanity. While there may, admittedly, be something to this facile perspective, it is intended to resonate in the contemporary mind with the evil tendencies of 'WE' peoples, and most especially 'WE' men, in our own time, assisting in the widespread promotion of the farcical, 'WE', retroactive 'guilt'. In our dumbed-down and intoxicated state, it is intended that we conclude that this is not just about particular events in history, but also that such behaviour is congenital and endemic to white, northern European men alone, and will remain true for all time. Meanwhile, the ongoing invasions of 'NWE' countries by 'WE' ones, militarily and economically, has continued unabated, while the invocation of historical colonisation in this movie helps to divert attention which might be attracted to that fact.

The Boov, then, although they are invaders and colonisers, are also to be simultaneously understood to be immigrants, while immigrants are further characterised as being generally subject to victimisation, as we see with the humans, who are represented by the 'NWE' immigrants Gratuity and her mother, who have only recently moved to the U.S.A. and whose victimisation is, ironically, that of being invaded. Again, this is a clever and cunning way to redefine their status to something ambiguous, as we struggle to relate these circumstances to events in the real world, where immigrants, as part of weaponised immigration, are, in fact, invaders, which is to say, also, that 'WE' people are the victims of such invasion. The propaganda, however, states only that all immigrants, and almost by extension, all 'NWE' people on the planet, are, somehow victims, the latter point being quietly supported by the reference to historical, 'WE' colonisation. Incidentally, such heavy-handed and incessant propaganda, mixed with equal amounts of heavy-handed and incessant silence, is necessary to try to maintain this agenda, because nearly everybody has come to recognise that immigration has long since been weaponised, and that this is wrong.

Obviously, trumpeting 'immigration' as an ultimate good is an extremely flawed perspective, which takes no account of the obvious facts that, firstly, the migrants will always have their original homes to return to if they choose, and are generally attempting to set up a second, more financially-advantageous option; secondly, that the indigenous citizens of the countries being invaded do not have the luxury of a second option, and are having their only home ransacked, while the invaders are financially supported at the expense, and to the financial detriment of, the native people; and thirdly, that the excesses of weaponised migration have long been deliberately engineered as part of the plan to destabilise and destroy 'WE' economies and cultures, with the ultimate aim of ethnic cleansing of 'WE' peoples. The only significant parts of this narrative in the movie which reflect any truth in the real world is the fact that the Boov arrive uninvited, and are entirely uninterested in the people or the cultures they are displacing.

What is more, unlike the Boov, who were grossly misinformed about the nature of humanity on Earth, and unlike many of the hoodwinked populations victimised by immigration, generally speaking, the immigrants being deployed in the real world are also aware of the truth of all this, and are, for the most part, and, it must be said, quite naturally, taking full advantage of the 'liberal' open-door policy for their own, personal, individual gain, albeit shortsightedly, and as pawns in the ongoing Great Game. The fact remains that it is 'WE' people, their cultures of belief in independence, sovereignty, equality, increased civilisation, peaceful coexistence, and liberty, for instance, as well as their relatively strong abilities to innovate, create, solve problems, and propensity to advance the causes of all of humanity, who present the greatest obstacle to the FWO's final solution, and which

thus marks them as the first target for destruction. Ironically, it is the relatively strong and misrepresented humanistic nature of 'WE' people, one of their most precious traits, which makes them susceptible to propaganda which appeals to their sympathetic predisposition, such as that concerning immigration to their countries. Promisingly, however, it might be considered that if the 'final solution' could be achieved easily, it would have happened already, and 'NWE' people would have by now discovered how very, very little, in fact, they are valued by the forces driving this agenda, finding themselves, as a much easier target than the 'WE' people, next in line for disposal. Although weaponised immigration remains in the vanguard of the weaponry ultimately arrayed against all of humanity, the greater plan is becoming increasingly apparent to 'WE' people, as they rediscover their dormant, political awareness, and this current incarnation of the ongoing agenda is running out of steam, with all nefarious plans and activities of the FWO being finally exposed and, as so often recently, backfiring.

Regarding the clever double-think which is deployed, we might return to the fact that the victims of the invasion, the people displaced, are shown to be primarily 'NWE' people. This is clear in the selection of the child and her mother as the focus of the suffering, as well as the appearance, in the colony of Happy Humanstown, of various races, where they are shown to be distressed and disadvantaged by the change in their circumstances, as opposed to any 'WE' people, who are only shown to appear idiotic and more dumbfounded by comparison. Since this is sometimes difficult to achieve while everyone is subject to the removal from their homes, we are presented, for example, with a 'WE' man caught naked in the shower, exploiting the moment for the purpose of making him also appear highly undignified. In this part of the movie, 'WE' people are also shown to appear relatively more scared, while 'NWE' people are shown to appear relatively more defiant, concerned and dignified, more upstanding and subtly admirable in their protests against the invasion, protesting, 'You'll never catch me', 'What?! No!', and "'New home"?!'.

Staying with the invasion scenes for the moment, the three places first portrayed at the point of invasion are Moscow, London and New York City, where, just before the relocation of humans gets underway, only 'WE' people are shown in the surprised crowds, although this is carefully managed by having almost all of them with their backs to the viewer. There is no reference at all to the rest of the countries and peoples on the planet, or, momentarily, of the multi-ethnic societies which exist in the cities shown. The question arises as to why the initial images of the crowds are exclusively of 'WE' people in those cities, and the answer would be in order to seed the magic of belief and expectation, and to deploy the double-think: all of us are supposed to witness the ease with which an idealised ethnic cleansing of 'WE' people takes place; 'WE' people are 'ethnically cleansed', but it is the 'NWE' people, as said, who suffer from the invasion. The switch comes with the move from the arrival of the Boov in the skies above the cities, for which only 'WE' people are present, to the subsequent scenes of removing people from their homes. The result, as has been stated, is that we are denied the opportunity to view 'WE' people as victims of immigration, although they are the only victims of this in the real world. This first impression is intended to be both a lasting one and a forgotten one, in line with our cognitively dissonant culture. The fact that 'WE' people are victims of this invasion is heavily downplayed, so the agenda gets to have its cake and eat it, too. The stamping of this image on the psyche of the viewer, though it is merely a matter of a couple of seconds, appears to be a highly desirable step before moving on to the further layers. Besides, it is almost as if to claim, for a moment, or in the imagination, anyway, that these cities currently belong to those 'WE' people as if they had not already been suffering from weaponised immigration, in the real world. In short, this snapshot of exclusively 'WE' populations about to be ethnically cleansed is another fringe benefit on the journey of the main narrative, and an example of where the race and immigration narratives are, inevitably, united.

The immigration narrative is strongly and dishonestly invoked, the purpose being to reinforce the situation as a fact of life which we ought to get used to, as if it 'just happens', like a force of nature; people are picked up from here, put down there, voluntarily or not, easily adapting to new homes, which can be anywhere at all, with no mention of cultural adaptation. Although the relocation of the world's population to Australia is inconvenient for them, and an infringement on their rights to choose

where they live, there is no sense at all of people truly belonging anywhere, while the only crime focussed on is that of the removal of the people itself. Indeed, the relocated people thus become, to some extent, another refugee group, another set of immigrants. They have been moved against their will, as if to equate this outrage with the fictitious predicament of having no choice about moving home in the real world. Furthermore, despite the inconvenience of being relocated, the humans are apparently well looked after. In a parallel with the real world, as well as with the communist utopia in general, they receive free and instant housing and, we presume, all sustenance necessary for survival, no longer having to work for a living. They could, therefore, look on the bright side of the situation and, much like Captain Smek exclaims, paraphrasing a thought which runs through all immigrants' minds in the real world, 'And I really love this planet; look at all this great stuff they've got'.

Taking this a step further, we could consider how this is achieved through focus on individual characters. For this, we are presented with someone on the enemy side, Oh, helping out a besieged and exiled victim, Gratuity. Although befriending the natives is not prohibited, this is not the usual Boov behaviour, and a divide is being bridged by Oh alone, and we are invited, very naturally, to commend this behaviour. In this, we may be delicately being invited to view the native 'WE' who betrays their homeland or fellow indigenous citizens to outsiders, as heroic, since for a short time upon their arrival, the Boov are invaders as well as residents. Thus, a role model for such betrayal, on the scale of supporting unrestricted immigration to one's country, since that is the chief topic of the movie, is provided. To support this nuanced point, we are also invited to sympathise with Oh in his effort to welcome neighbours for a housewarming party, the point being that he is right for being open to mingling and befriending neighbours, while they are coldhearted in avoiding and rejecting such overtures. Their values of self-centredness are stated clearly by would-be friend, Kyle: 'Parties are useless and take up valuable Boov time'.

To reinforce the point, the indigenous citizen, portrayed by Gratuity, is also guilty of befriending one of the invaders. This is not strongly stated, however, for it takes Gratuity some time to understand Oh and the Boov, and, until the last moment, she only ever works with him for her own advantage. Nevertheless, the point is made: refugee and native citizen can overcome self-interest and become friends. And this is, of course, a laudable sentiment, one with which we could not argue. After all, if we can all get along, why not associate as much with one person as with another, as much with newcomers as with natives? Why discriminate? And there is nothing wrong with it in principle. Indeed, it is not a question which is ever asked, since it would expose the fact that this point and the questioning of immigration when it is weaponised are almost mutually exclusive. And people are no different anywhere: any people long-settled in every country of the world would naturally resist weaponised, large-scale, fast-paced immigration while at the same time being able to befriend and support individual foreigners or immigrants. The two positions are quite unrelated, and the latter ought not to be invoked in support of the former.

The bottom line being made is that one can belong anywhere, can fit in anywhere, with any people, and that one's homeland does not belong exclusively to the long-settled people living there; it is up for sharing, regardless of what you may feel regarding nationhood or homeland. However, even if one's natural feeling for the brotherhood of humanity can be stretched to accommodate a stance of unlimited sharing, the breaking point is reached when no permission has been given for this by the native population, no acceptable rationale has been provided for the scale or the speed of the sharing, and the incoming population is provided with resources and support, paid for, without permission and by extortion or uninformed 'acquiescence', by those natives, and which the natives, forced to slave to scrape a lesser existence for themselves than the newcomers enjoy, could only dream of receiving.

To accept this necessitates a rejection not only of human and animal nature, but also of history, including the history of the failed experiments with communism. Such a situation is hardly sustainable, and ultimately threatens countries with economic and social collapse. In order to maintain it for as long as possible while the plan is being carried out, therefore, all manner of

authoritarian measures are deployed, the chief and first casualties being freedom of speech and freedom of information, as well as freedom of movement, which is ironic considering the weaponised immigration aspect of the agenda. Well, let us not pretend that these freedoms have ever been enjoyed by humanity, even if the illusion of having them has occasionally been enjoyed, but we live in relatively fast-paced, or supposedly information-rich times, whereby the augmentation of the illusion of free speech, information and movement has prompted an increase in censorship and multiple restrictions of fundamental rights, to the point that it has become noticeable to a greater proportion of humanity than ever before. Thereby, the FWO is forced to double down on its cynical mendacity and tight control of its media and puppets in surface level politics, lulling the sleepwalkers, as well as those who are struggling to stay awake, deeper into the manufactured dream-world, encouraging them in their instinctive rejection of the disconcerting signs of attack and collapse, and acceptance of the illusory world of prime-time propaganda. This has to be maintained, habitual, familiar; it needs feeding with content, ostensibly flippant and inconsequential, colourful distraction; enter: the Boov.

## Narrative 2: race

Although race is a topic, not necessarily problematic, which is naturally apparent to everyone on the planet, it is all the more pertinent at this time for 'WE' peoples and cultures, these being the ones victimised by weaponised immigration. In the movie, species and race become interchangeable terms as the Boov, a non-human species, represent both 'WE' invaders, as well as immigrants, and therefore a 'NWE' race. The latter fact is reinforced by the invaders being 'persons of colour', since the Boov, noticeably never white, change colour according to their mood. One of the fringe benefits here is the implication that 'WE' people cannot be immigrants or in need of moving to a new home; in the puppeteered, FWO mindset of our world, they have no such entitlement to equate with that of others, but only exist now in order to have their cultures, peoples and countries ransacked and stolen.

Since, as we have established, the humans, as the victims of immigration, cannot be shown to be 'WE' people, the movie is careful to plant mixed-race couples among the crowds, as well as a fair smattering of mixed-race children, not least since the FWO has no place for 'WE' people in its 'final solution' plans. In fact, Gratuity's mother, apparently of mixed-race herself, is lighter-skinned than Gratuity is, so the mixing of the races is evidently at the heart of the Narrative, adding to an implicit back-story stretching back a couple of generations. The point is reinforced by the joining in friendship of the main characters, Gratuity and Oh, who also happen to be female and male, and, ultimately, by the mixing of the Boov with the humans in the final scene, showing us that, in the end, intersecting with the immigration Narrative, the invaders were ultimately welcomed to stay and make their home on the planet and, even more to the point, the U.S.A. Indeed, there is mixing of 'races' shown wherever possible, even to the extent of a momentary scene imagined by Oh, of a 'group hug' with penguins. This aspect of the narrative also separately extends to the Boov themselves, who, even in their neutral state, have different colours or shades of skin.

It needs to be mentioned, even at the risk of labouring the point, that there is nothing wrong with such mixing, or even of migration in general, when it might naturally occur; despite countless unlawful manoeuvres to the contrary, throughout recorded history, it is our birthright to make such choices as who we mix or join with, as well as where we live. However, this is not unfolding in organic innocence on our planet today, but being explicitly engineered, a cynical removal of diversity in the name of trumpeted diversity. It should also be borne in mind that the idea of equality among human races is philosophically redundant, not least because of the countless ways in which people and peoples differ. On balance, it is far better that we retain and celebrate our differences; it is the celebration of all our differences, non-exclusively, which should be the focus of equality and fairness.

Such parity is not of concern to the makers of Hollywood movies, however. As criminally odd as this might sound to those who had not noticed, in this movie, as in countless others, we are invited, in both subtle and overt ways, to partake in, and acquiesce to, the denigration of one broad group of people, 'WE', and the celebration of all others, 'NWE'. Needless to say, it is never the other way around. Obviously, this is not responsible, it is not mature, and it is not clever; it is facile, insulting to everyone's intelligence, and, as it contributes further to the mountains of such pieces of the same narrative to which everyone has been subjected to throughout their lives, not a little dangerous. For example, besides the inclusion of a 'NWE' child as the heroic main character in this movie, there is the fact that the Boov, as would-be 'persons of colour', and with their immigrant, 'NWE' status established, are shown to be feeling, emotional creatures, since the changes in their emotions result in an instant change in their body coloration; somehow, this is far less apparent in the human population, who, representing 'WE' people only in relation to the Boov's invasion, are given little airtime, except for the endearing main character, Gratuity, overtly 'NWE'. This is very refined recipe work.

At one point, when her mother is describing her to a Boov, in an effort to locate her, Gratuity's mother states, quite truthfully, that 'she has [...] beautiful, brown skin'. While this may be true, the true test of the matter, as a worthwhile thought experiment, is whether the statement 'she has beautiful, white skin' would ever be permitted in a Hollywood movie. I think you know the answer to that question. As such, this statement, in our own culturally repressive context, qualifies as yet another instance of rampant racism. On another occasion, before the invasion of Earth commences, Captain Smek states that 'the native savages are simple and backwards' while showing a short video clip of a 'WE' infant as the Boov crowd reels in horror and Oh reacts with the statement, 'they are so ugly, they are cute'. This is similar to the moment when the 'WE' man is caught off-guard in the shower, almost naked and looking foolish. Again, we should consider whether it would be possible with this instance to replace the 'WE' infant with a 'NWE' infant.

It ought to be mentioned that there is, of course, as with Gratuity, nothing in the least wrong with assigning leadership and heroic roles to 'NWE' people in movies. A problem has arisen, however, because the intersectionality taxonomy means such roles are now assigned almost exclusively to anyone except 'WE' males, with villainous characters almost exclusively assigned to 'WE' men. This is especially wrong because it is consciously, knowingly, and maliciously done. If you can find a 'NWE' person cast as a villain, or a 'WE' male cast as a hero or leader, in any movie of recent times, you will also find that this is qualified in some way that also serves the Agenda, while it may also be serving as a 'mask' for other components of the product's script, to allow for plausible deniability for those who wish to deny the facts concerning the emperor's nakedness. Oh is allowed to be a co-hero in this movie because, although his role is partly that of a 'WE' coloniser, it is also that of a 'NWE' immigrant, with his skin colour(s) falling conveniently into neither category.

Finally, the Gorg mission is a racial one, for it is trying to save its own race from extinction. It is the children, or the amoeba, of the race, who are being buffeted here and there after being kidnapped by Captain Smek, for which great risks are being taken. In short, the Gorg have been wronged by the unwitting and arrogant Boov, and its entire species endangered. Thus, race-extinction, or genocide, to no surprise, rears its head as a theme in the narrative. This is left to float in the air, tenuously suggestive as a fact of life, such that, in the links we might make between the relocated and encamped people, the near-extinct and desperate Gorg, the refugee narrative, and the homeless, wandering Boov, we are being invited to draw intertextually upon other propaganda to which we have been exposed, regarding the plight of European Jews, and other immigrants, and slaves, throughout mainstream 'history'. Both because this is not the main focus of the story, and because it would be difficult to demonise any one group in this story as being responsible for crimes of attempted genocide or race-enslavement, since the assigned roles have already been necessarily conflated by the immigration and racial signposting, it is left hanging. However, the fact remains that a species almost became extinct though the idiocy of Captain Smek, and, although Oh, readable as 'WE' male, via his voice, playing opposite a 'NWE' female, does the right thing and saves the day, we also read Smek, via his voice, as a 'WE' male, portrayed as an idiotic, self-serving, short-sighted,

lying, infantile, self-appointed dictator, and as being the one who, knowingly or not, risked the extinction of all three species: humans, Gorg and Boov. You might be tempted, even after all that has been said, to chalk this up to accident, or an imaginary law of averages, but the fact remains: Smek is not a 'NWE' person. Neither, for that matter, is he female, which brings us to our next Narrative.

## Narrative 3: gender

The gender narrative is, as usual, featured here as a combination of the lionisation of the female, and the denigration and sidelining of the male. The hero and main protagonist of this story is female. Gratuity always does the right thing, she is endearing, brave, and clever, and has our full attention and admiration. What a hero she is, for instance, for trapping Oh in a fridge when they first meet, and being able to drive a car, or at least figure out how to do so in a few seconds (this in common with Vanellope in the movie 'Wreck-It Ralph' (2012)). The point is that she is able to do this on her own, as a female, and without a parent, having the strength of character, innovation and know-how, to work independently. Again, there would be nothing wrong with this if it weren't for the obvious, aforesaid ubiquity of such casting choices, based on an obvious agenda. Great care has also been taken to omit males from the picture, and the neat way of sidestepping this is by allowing for male roles only if they are non-human. As a result, there are no positive role models for males; only seriously flawed male characters in the way of the Boov characters, Oh, Captain Smek, and Kyle. Even the Gorg, when we finally meet the representation of that species, perhaps assuming it to be male because of its aggressive stance in relation to the Boov, is both diminutive (a kind of starfish just a few inches high) and non-gendered. This is only marginally less true for the Boov because, to us, they all look the same, without gender differences. Their procreation and family are not mentioned, except when Oh mentions that 'Boov are not having "my moms"' and 'When Boov are young, we are kept in the warming oven', so we are encouraged to think that an absence of gender, as well as an absence of family life, is possible. This is inconclusive, since familial estrangement is not a main Narrative here, and just dropped in the mix to linger and develop in the viewer's mind. Besides this, we are encouraged to view the Boov, by way of most of the voices we can identify, as male or predominantly male. This is clearly because they are the ones who have caused the problems for all of humanity, and specifically for Gratuity and her mother.

As an aside to this, and in line with the idea that gender might be a social construct rather than a biological one, a transvestite Boov is added to the picture. This identity is first foisted on this Boov, a 'male', early in the story, as Gratuity is setting out on her heroic quest, as he walks into an ingenious booby trap which she has set. Strangely, this trap is not designed to harm or fend off a Boov intruder, but only to ridicule them. This is achieved by dousing them in pink glitter and providing them with a hairstyle and a pink dress, so apparently, this was designed to be inflicted upon a male. The point is made over an hour later in the closing scene, when we find the beglittered Boov still in the same guise, now apparently by choice. Hence, the issue of gender confusion and transgender normalisation is added to the mix.

The other female character in the story is Gratuity's mother, Lucy Tucci. We are brought to sympathise with her character almost as much as with that of Gratuity. Their reunification is the purpose of Gratuity's quest, and hence of the main part of the storyline, and we are afforded a few opportunities to view her in a heroic light, too, as the responsible, competent parent, the brave migrant, and the mother who is constantly striving to find and protect her lost daughter. Clearly, there is no father in the picture of this 'family', nor even any mention of such, but we are encouraged to perceive Gratuity and her mother as a complete family nevertheless, with the cat thrown in to support this notion.

When Oh claims ignorance of what a mother is, Gratuity concludes, 'Boov don't have families; no wonder you take things and don't care about anybody else', as if having only a mother, as she does, ensures a good upbringing resulting in humane behaviour. This conflicts with what we know about the real world, where the absence of either one of the parents is more likely to have negative results in this respect. Besides the point about families consisting of only mothers with children, ideally daughters, of course, this is also carefully calculated to also demonise the Boov who, as mentioned, are vaguely supposed to be perceived as predominantly male. Oh concludes, in turn, that Gratuity's mother 'is a very important human's person to you, more important than others', allowing for the idea that, even if there were a father in Gratuity's life, his importance would never be able to equal that of her mother. In addition, Gratuity has her mother's surname, so there is also the subtle indication that her parents did not marry, so that her father has probably never been present, and never contributed to her upbringing, the conclusions being that fathers are either unwilling to look after their children, or that they are unnecessary to children's upbringing, since mothers, apparently, all have the emotional and mental strength to undertake this duty alone.

The denigration of men in this movie, since they are not part of the story, is also achieved through the denigration of the Boov. In this, besides the array of negative characteristics, Gratuity enjoys open season on insulting and physically attacking Oh, a male, and we are, one presumes, supposed to find this amusing. Returning to the useful thought experiment for a moment, consider whether portrayal of this behaviour running in the other direction would remain acceptable. We are generally encouraged to look down on the Boov, not only because of their invasion and theft of the planet, but also because of their extremely cowardly nature. They are also anti-social, selfish, self-important and dull. We are told that, besides enjoying a song titled 'Motionless and Obedient', 'Boov are not unique', and that they 'do not friend', 'do telling jokes', 'party', or 'have neighbours'. Not only this but their existence, besides running away from danger, is generally meaningless and without value, while this sole purpose in itself is a conflation of a negative human trait interestingly coupled with their would-be, positive immigrant status. Furthermore, Oh is shown to be generally prone to deceit on a number of occasions: lying about having laser vision, reprogramming the car to take them to Antarctica instead of Paris, trying to steal the car and leave Gratuity stranded at the gas station, stating 'I never lie', followed soon after with 'I un-promise', and finally by telling Gratuity that her mother is on the Boov ship escaping from the Gorg. Finally, thinking back to the 'WE' man exposed taking a shower, there is also the incident at the gas station bathroom, where we are given to understand that Oh, in his ignorance, has drunk urine from the urinal and tried to eat the urinal soap. With these characteristics alongside their generally foolish behaviour, we are left with nothing to admire the Boov for, and every reason to deride and look down on them.

When it comes to Oh in particular, he is generally spoken to rudely by Gratuity a number of times. For instance, when he first mends her car, enabling it to fly, she yells, 'You were supposed to fix it! What is this?!' Soon after, when he is meddling with the car's control panel she tells him 'Keep your Boov paws off my car', while in the next moment being very pleased to see that he has cooked her some food. At the gas station, while he is explaining some toiletry issues from which Boov suffer, she selfishly cuts him off with 'That's enough!' When he reappears from the ocean where he had gone to save his own life, she scolds him, 'You cannot just leave someone alone like that!' and we are then supposed to be reminded of how very neglectful men are of children when she tells him, 'This is child endangerment, which is a crime, by the way!'. Later on, we are witness to the statements, 'Stop being such a Boov!' and 'You're just a Boov!', which carries racist overtones, which are apparently acceptable coming from little Miss Privileged Minority, and when Oh tells her, 'Boov do not dancing', she retorts, 'I can tell!'. Oh is also physically assaulted by Gratuity on many occasions: when he is shoved violently into the fridge in the store where they first meet, when he is pushed out of the bathroom at the gas station, when she throws a heavy can into his face, knocking him over, then slams him against the door on the inside of the car, restrains him while she ties him up with duct tape, rips off the last piece of duct tape from his forehead, kicks him in the head when he resurfaces on the ocean with a peace offering, slapping his hand away when he is trying to reason with her for her own safety, kicking him into a wall when he finally returns to help her find her mother, and shoving him backwards after he has finally saved everyone by stopping the Gorg



in its attack. Besides this, when they first meet, she also threatens him with 'Our tradition is to punch you in the nose. Hold still.' And neither is Gratuity's mother beyond violence when it comes to Oh, giving him a hard kick when she first sees him. All of this behaviour is contrasted with Oh's innocence and complete absence of malice. Although all these acts of violence are explicable to some extent, the message remains: not only do females have permission to physically assault males with impunity, but that females are also morally, cerebrally and physically dominant compared to them.

One final interesting footnote surfaces with the appearance of Joan of Arc, prominently featured in the Paris scene with the Eiffel Tower. The tower, being composed of freemasonic symbolism, and also representative of male achievement, is overturned as the statue of Joan appears, which initially saves Gratuity and Oh from being caught on the spire of the Tower, then lands heavily on a nemesis Boov, Kyle, landing upright, golden and shining on solid ground after being released from within a large, airborne cluster of grey statues of male soldiers. Whether or not we are supposed to associate Gratuity's spirit and courage with that of the Maid, or to simply subconsciously note and log the appearance, to coincide with any later consideration of the heroic stand which the Maid took against the British army, her appearance is highly conspicuous.

## Narrative: other

It would be remiss of us not to point out that, as with so many movies, especially those targeting children, the storyline involves a separation of parents from children. This is a telltale sign which comes up in literally countless movies, especially in the Disney universe, from 'Bambi' (1942) to 'Big Hero 6' (2014). Although it is seldom a main Narrative, those being reserved, on the whole, for race and gender, it is not alone in contributing to a number of less extensively developed agenda points. While the separation-from-parents narrative is one of the most important of these, the others are also of some interest.

Home readily invokes the World war Two narrative of displaced and encamped peoples. There are, of course, also many refugee camps at the current time, across the Middle East, as a consequence of the general business plan or the FWO, but the kneejerk reaction to the very notion of 'camps' as prisons to represent World war Two alone has been previously programmed into viewers. This is deployed when the Boov invade and move into the apartments of forced evacuees, and then deport and imprison them. For these components of the storyline, we are supposed to reference similar portrayals in German-occupied Poland as portrayed in 'Schindler's List' (1993). Hence, the entire World war Two narrative is intertextually subsumed within this one, as if the viewer is being given the key to a 'Roman Room' mnemonic, which goes to show how effective the layering of countless movies can be in facilitating the replaying of propaganda points without spending any time in the re-telling. Somehow, then, the entire World war Two scenario of displaced peoples are now part of the Home narrative, with the intention that the suffering of European Jews, specifically, is to be equated with that of the 'economic migrants', also specifically, of very recent times. The intention is that we are softened in our attitude towards the plight of the Boov in their avoidance of the Gorg, who would represent Nazi Germany in this case. And yet, in keeping with the nature of this movie, it is less than explicit. The choice of portraying an occupied Paris, furthermore, is also clearly a nod towards the World war Two propaganda narratives, and possibly the intersecting, where it exists, of the current FWO with freemasonry. Besides bolstering a narrative outside the remit of this movie, we are also left with a demonisation of the German people, and all without wasting a moment on stating anything explicitly.

In Home, there is also the portrayal of the dystopian surveillance state. Boov society is shown to be a technocracy where all citizens can be monitored and tracked, as shown by the difficulty Oh has in avoiding detection as he accompanies Gratuity in her heroic quest. We even get a peek behind the Orwellian state curtain here, when the truth about the deception habitually employed by the state is

ridiculed in statements like Oh's 'Boov do not steal and abduct; Boov liberate and befriend', an example of a successful outcome of repetitive state propaganda. Another example of mendacious broadcasting arises when we see Captain Smek telling the Boov population, 'We are definitely not doomed', while in the next moment, when the camera is switched off, exclaiming, 'We are doomed!'.

Of even lesser status is the mention of Antarctica. This may be intended as a ritualistic incident, like a spell, or perhaps it is merely intended to add to a general awareness that Antarctica exists, for the purpose of supporting other narratives beyond the scope of this movie, which may or may not include controlled and limited disclosure of what exists or used to exist at Antarctica, or the ongoing silence about what Antarctica is like, what the FWO has been doing there, or why nobody is allowed to visit that continent. This minuscule detail would be easily dismissed if we did not see it appear in other movies, such as 'Madagascar' (2005), more obviously in 'Surf's Up' (2007) and 'Happy Feet' (2006), and obliquely in 'Ice Age' (2002) and 'Frozen' (2013). Although those movies, all animation and generally targeting children, have their own agenda narrative points unrelated to Antarctica, the point is that the existence of continents of ice are actualised in the viewer's mind, despite Antarctica's also comprising large swathes of ice-free land. Generally, we are invited to be reminded that Antarctica is a frozen wasteland where there exists nothing of interest.

Finally, it is worth mentioning the removed and rejected monuments we see in the movie. For the most part, these have been removed to float in the sky, alongside all the other rejected items which the Boov consider to be useless. The rejected or displaced monuments include the Eiffel Tower, as mentioned, a remodeled (desecrated) statue of 'Liberty', the Brandenburg Gate, the Gateway Arch, the Sydney Opera House, the Acropolis, the Atomium, the Defense Grand Arch, Notre Dame cathedral, the Arc de Triomphe and, less sensationally, a Danish windmill, a typical farmhouse, and a typical plantation mansion. No other monuments appear besides these which, much like the cancellation of Christmas, which covers the two weeks from the Boov invasion to life getting back to normal, appears to be, in line with the main propaganda theme of the movie, a general onslaught on whatever might symbolise 'WE' culture or, more specifically, whatever might symbolise the achievements and heritage of that culture. Overall, this is in line with typical attempts to obliterate the history of an entire race, as attempted by occasional twentieth century regimes and, more recently, the puppeteered and FWO-enlisted vagabonds who destroyed a number of historical monuments in the Middle East. This is generally undertaken as a way of undermining morale and identity, like an M.K.Ultra tactic deployed en masse, and for laying the groundwork for rewriting and overwriting history to suit a new regime's narrative. In the light of all this, it is almost shocking to see a few 'WE' men at the party in the closing scene, although there will be at least one underhanded reason for this, too. For all its endearing characterisation and feelgood outcomes, therefore, Home appears to be the genocide movie par-excellence.

# 3

# Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri

2017

## the storyline

Noticing the three eponymous, derelict billboards, Mildred Hayes decides she will use them to attempt to shame Chief Willoughby of the local police into making more efforts to resolve the case of her murdered daughter, Angela. At the advertising agency, she arranges with the young representative, Red Welby, interrupting him while he is idly leering at his young, female assistant, Pamela, to hire the boards for one year. When Deputy Sheriff Dixon notices Mildred's new posters being applied to the billboards on Easter Sunday evening, he stops to question the workers, one of whom is a young 'NWE' man who grimly says he recognises Dixon, spits on the ground and turns away. Seeing the full message, 'RAPED WHILE DYING / AND STILL NO ARRESTS? / HOW COME, CHIEF WILLOUGHBY?', Dixon telephones to tell Willoughby, interrupting him during his dinner with his family.

When Mildred's son, Robbie, being driven to school by her one morning, first sees the billboards, he is silently furious. After this, on her way to work, Mildred happens to witness Willoughby striding angrily across the street from his office to the advertising agency, and we then see Willoughby and his Desk Sergeant, Cedric, in Red Welby's office trying to intimidate him into illegally disclosing the identity of their sponsor, but are stumped by the fact that no law has been broken. After a brief argument between Cedric and Dixon, we learn from Cedric that Dixon has 'tortured a guy in custody', while Willoughby defends him claiming, unconvincingly, that there was no evidence to support this claim. Dixon, meanwhile, has stormed out of the police department to confront Red Welby in the street, shouting at him threateningly to remove the billboard posters. When Dixon grabs him violently by the throat and threatens to kill him, Red Welby replies that he thought Dixon only killed 'black dudes', as Willoughby steps in and struggles to restrain Dixon.

In order to publicise the billboards, Mildred films an interview on site with a local television news programme, in which she also mentions the police department's violently racist behaviour, after which Willoughby visits her to discuss the billboards. When he tells her he is dying from cancer, she replies that almost everybody in town knows it already, so he is surprised that she targeted him with the posters.

We next see Red Welby playing pool in a bar with James, a local dwarf, when he is approached and verbally harassed by Dixon. Mildred joins them, is complimented by James, and insults Dixon. Father Montgomery is at Mildred's, talking to Robbie when she gets home, and tells her that the town is against the billboards because they know what a good man Willoughby is, and we learn that Mildred used to attend Father Montgomery's church. Mildred then states that Father Montgomery has no right to say anything to her about her daughter or the billboards while being part of a criminal gang, making the point that all clergy are culpable for each other's crimes, by which she means sexual assaults of children. She then tells him to leave.

The strain of the billboards is showing as we see Willoughby with his doctor, flying into a temper at the mention of them. After hearing that the 'fat dentist' has registered a complaint with the police about the billboards, we see Mildred in the dentist's chair. As he maliciously attempts to extract a tooth without anesthetic, in order to torture her, she grabs his drill and stabs him in the thumb with it. Willoughby and Dixon then arrest Mildred for this assault. While waiting in the interview room with Dixon, she taunts him about his 'nigger torturing', effectively drawing a confession out of him as Willoughby arrives and asks Dixon to leave the room, then mentions that he could make it difficult for Mildred to pay for the billboards by tying her up with legal difficulties. He then mentions Mildred's ex-husband, Charlie, in another attempt to provoke her, but suddenly coughs up blood and has to be rushed to hospital. As he is put into the ambulance, he tells a protesting Dixon to let Mildred go free. Back home, Mildred has a flashback of Angela on the day of her murder, asking to borrow the car, which ends up in an argument during which both A and Mildred shout that they hope A gets raped while she is out walking. Back in the present, Charlie turns up in a temper, cursing and shouting about the billboards and their cost, soon becoming violent. As he has Mildred pinned to the wall by the throat, his young female partner, Penelope, enters, comically interrupting them to ask to use the bathroom.

While Willoughby is incapacitated, Dixon, following a suggestion of his mother's, arrests Mildred's work colleague, Denise, whereupon Mildred goes to the police department to confront Dixon at his desk. This is followed by Mildred greeting a wild deer at the billboards, then the news of a mystery benefactor paying for another month's rental of the billboards. We then see Willoughby on a picnic day out with his family, after which he kills himself, leaving letters for Dixon and Mildred. Dixon is distraught upon hearing about Dixon's death, and, blaming the stress of the billboards, decides to take out his feelings on Red Welby and the advertising agency office, punching Red Welby and Pamela in the face, and throwing Red Welby out of the upper-storey window into the street. Chief Abercrombie is posted to take over from Willoughby at the police department. Since he is 'NWE', Dixon is outraged, but is instantly fired.

We next see a can of drink thrown at Mildred's windscreen at the school when she drops off Robbie, prompting her to physically assault two children for this. Later on, a man comes into Mildred's gift shop claiming to have possibly been a friend of Willoughby, making obscene comments about Mildred's daughter's death. This is immediately followed by the arrival of Willoughby's tearful and furious widow, Anne, delivering Willoughby's letter. In this, he mentions his concern for Angela's death and regret at the inability to resolve it, as well as the fact that he was the mystery benefactor who made the next month's payment for the billboards.

We are led to believe that Dixon then sets fire to the billboards, and Mildred encounters these on fire as she is driving Robbie home. She takes the car's fire extinguisher to try to douse the flames, sending Robbie to fetch another extinguisher, and Chief Abercrombie turns up and tells her, 'We ain't all the enemy'. There is more fire one night when Dixon goes to collect his letter from Willoughby, which has been left for him at the police department by Cedric. He reads it while inside the police department, using a flashlight. At that moment, Mildred has sneaked into the advertising agency office opposite, intending to take her revenge on the police department, taking them all to be culpable for Dixon's crimes, according to the rationale she had described to Father Montgomery. She makes two phone calls to the police department to establish that nobody is inside the building,

before setting fire to it by throwing molotov cocktails from the window which Red Welby was thrown out of. Dixon has his headphones on, so has been unable to hear the phone, and is otherwise too engrossed in reading his letter to notice the growing fire. When he does, he leaps through the window, observed by a shocked Mildred, and ends up lying in the street with his clothes on fire. James arrives on the scene and puts out the fire on Dixon's clothes, and when Chief Abercrombie questions them, James provides Mildred with an alibi, claiming they had been at his place and came upon the fire together; Mildred goes along with this, pretending they are romantically involved. James then asks Mildred to go out to dinner with him, and she accepts. Meanwhile, Dixon is put into the same hospital room as his victim, Red Welby, to whom he apologises, and they seem to make up.

Jerome, the 'NWE' billboard poster who had earlier recognised Dixon, possibly having been one of his victims, turns up at Mildred's house with a set of duplicate posters from the agency. We next find them, along with Denise and James, putting up the new posters at the billboards. We next see Jerome and Denise in a bar, and Dixon on the other side of the room, when two men arrive and sit in the booth behind Dixon. One of them is the man who visited Mildred's store. Dixon overhears him telling his acquaintance about a rape-murder he has committed, leading Dixon to draw an obvious conclusion and, having regrets about Mildred's plight, to undertake an investigation. He goes outside to check the number plate of their car, then goes back in to pick a fight with the murderer by scratching his face, thereby acquiring some of his DNA under his own fingernails, whereupon he is attacked by the two men. Jerome tries to intervene, telling the murderer that Dixon is a police officer, so the two men flee.

At the same time, James and Mildred are having their dinner in a quiet restaurant when they see Charlie and Penelope arrive. When James goes to use the toilet, Charlie comes over to speak to Mildred, revealing that he was the one who had set fire to the billboards. James soon storms out, feeling unbearably insulted by Mildred. We next see Dixon arriving at Mildred's home to let her know that he may be on the trail of Angela's murderer, and they somehow make up. However, Chief Abercrombie telephones to tell him that the DNA did not match. When Dixon calls Mildred to tell her the bad news, they arrange to drive to the veteran's home to kill him anyway, since Dixon is convinced that he is a rapist. They leave in the early morning, and as they drive out of Ebbing, Mildred confesses that she had been the one to set fire to the police department, and Dixon confirms that he had thought as much. They are both undecided about killing the veteran, and Mildred says, 'I guess we can decide along the way'.

## Narrative 1: race

While this Narrative is incredibly common among all media, and one of the main features and purposes of practically every movie, in this one, it appears to be particularly prominent, almost dominating the entire work and overshadowing the other Narratives, such as gender, with which it intersects in a familiar, mutually augmenting way. As usual, we should pay attention to the race of every role, in order to identify their contributions to the whole, and here, we have three distinct 'NWE' roles, Denise, Jerome and Chief Abercrombie, conspicuous in their minority among the cast, and their subdued presence, which tells us exactly how this is supposed to appear. On the other hand, the police department, until Willoughby's demise, is composed entirely of 'WE' men, in a clear imitation of numerous other movies from across the decades which feature 'WE'-male-dominated police departments located in the southern states of the U.S.A. and/or home to the typical Hollywood typecasting of 'WE' male police officers, their traits, as clearly showcased here, being racism, 'homophobia', and sexism, as well as a propensity to band together in their oppression of others, and to cover for each other. The intention in this case is not merely to show them as being vindictive or antagonistic towards 'NWE' people, non-heterosexuals or women, but also to highlight the extent of their ignorance, stupidity and bigotry. Although this point has always been the aim of such

previous portrayals, allowing for the dynamism of the struggle between hero and nemesis, here it has been exaggerated to an extent almost unparalleled before. It is as if, in fact, the movie's producers decided that such previous portrayals were not explicit enough. And, in crafting the message to be so overt and inescapable, it was necessary to camouflage this in numerous ways.

This camouflage is achieved mainly through the distraction of the gender Narrative, by which we mean the anti-male/pro-female Narrative. This is also so extreme that we can deduce that the two Narratives were augmented with the intention of trying to drown each other out. This would allow for a plausible deniability which also plays out in the minds of the audience subjected to this; they might think, for instance, that a certain portrayal or incident looks designed for the sole reason of demonising 'WE' people, but because of the intersectionality, can also see it as the demonisation of men. Being, then, undecided about what is being communicated, the audience's objective discernment short-circuits, and they are left to passively drown in the confluence of both propaganda streams. While the end result is incredible, it would appear that we have become so used to such portrayals, so tolerant of them, in fact, that we do not register any surprise. It is as if we can almost predict the nature of the policemen, represented by Dixon and Willoughby, before they utter a word or do anything; merely seeing them allows us to instantly cross-reference them to the Hollywood stereotype of 'WE' male police officers, especially those of the southern States.

Another way the race Narrative is camouflaged is through the way that the protagonist, the hero Mildred, is shown to have a great deal in common with Dixon, despite being female. However, this is revealed only towards the very end of the storyline; until that point, our opinion of the men is allowed to develop unchecked. Meanwhile, the camouflage is also present in the delayed sympathy we are invited to have for Willoughby and Dixon, in their separate predicaments of death and loss, respectively. Their appalling and entrenched attitudes are also apparently dealt with using a little comedy, which emanates from themselves and Mildred, while the entire composite of the Narrative is submerged beneath the very intriguing and engaging notion of Mildred's use of the billboards; the quirkiness of this carries the viewer through practically the entire storyline, allowing for the unchallenged absorption of the incidental propaganda. The final main use of camouflage is the absence of any direct attacks on 'NWE' people, with some very real attacks by 'WE' people on other 'WE' people, as shown in Dixon's violent assault on Red Welby, the veteran's attack on Dixon, and the apparent victimisation of Mildred and her daughter through a neglect of judicial investigation into the latter's murder. Meanwhile, the intimation of physical intimidation and unprovoked assault by 'WE' men on 'NWE' people makes an important contribution, in the extramural violence perpetrated by Dixon against a 'NWE' person, presumably Jerome, and the moment we witness Dixon's despicable arrest and incarceration of 'NWE' Denise. In this, until the arrival of Chief Abercrombie, we have the numerical fact that all 'NWE' people in this town, since we have only been shown these two, are routinely physically victimised by Dixon or the police department.

To reiterate: it is crucial here that, while the flaws of the 'WE' people are being showcased, even where there is no direct connection to the race aspect of the storyline, the race Narrative is being deeply underlined due to the fact that the characters are 'WE' people. To portray the characters as unfeeling, for instance, is a clear statement about 'WE' people being unfeeling. This is irrefutably the case, given the context, which relies somewhat on our previous exposure to other Hollywood products, where police officers, and 'WE' people in general, in the southern States, have been portrayed as bigoted and uncompassionate. The three 'NWE' characters are carefully placed, and their contributions apparently carefully weighed, in order to highlight the fact that the other characters are 'WE' people. This effect is very much assisted by the fact that the deployment of the roles is simplified, in order to communicate the propaganda more clearly. Both Denise and Jerome are incidental roles, existing merely as the shadows which help to throw forward and illuminate the markedly different 'WE' roles, whereas Chief Abercrombie, while serving the same purpose, and having a more significant impact on the storyline, is nevertheless very underplayed; we do not see very much of him, or any real character development. This lets us know that the spotlight is supposed to remain intently on the 'WE' roles, specifically and clearly Mildred, Willoughby and Dixon. The other camouflage running alongside this is the assortment of other, comparatively minor

'WE' roles, which assist just enough to cast the 'NWE' people as a minority, and to support the showcasing of 'WE' people as degenerate, such as in their domestic lives.

The context is also enhanced with an emphasis on the conservative, which is to say Hollywood's version of the entrenched and bigoted portrayals of the locale, displayed by the usual images selected for their triggering effect: a statue of a Confederate soldier, shown to loom over and look down upon the town, and an array of U.S.A. flags, not least outside and inside of the police department, and the 'Southern Charms Gift Shoppe' where Mildred works. There are also images of traditional, small-town, wooden churches, the most prominent of which is directly aligned with the front door of Dixon's house, as if these are everywhere, and a part of the pervasive sickness which infects these people and their culture. The stereotyping is also taken to the extent of dressing the men in plaid shirts, a Hollywood hallmark of the hillbilly, the ignorant and conservative 'WE' man, being unimaginative, conformist, and predictable. At different times, we see such a shirt on Charlie, his son Robbie, Dixon, and James, with the message being that this must be a part of the wardrobe of all the 'WE' men in such towns. All of this is set against the equally powerful backdrop of some local accents, and a number of country and western songs, to the extent that Dixon is singing such a song the first time we see him, 'The Streets of Laredo', which is, significantly, a first-person, farewell, death song. These songs help to tie us resolutely to the area and trigger us to remember the 'WE' people's despicably traditional (and traditionally despicable) ways.

The portrayal of the main characters, then, with their domestic entourages, is chiefly about telling us why we should despise 'WE' people. And, while they are not shown to be directly oppressing any 'NWE' people, their attitudes in this respect are nevertheless showcased, almost as if they are suppressing a natural urge; the intention is that their racist and other despicable predilections are portrayed as being congenital, inviting us to draw logical conclusions from this: they cannot be cured, and they ought to be removed from society, for the good of everyone else. The catalogue of incidents which illustrate their ugly behaviour and opinions fall into a few broad categories: things they say, or have previously done, the way they behave with their families at home, and their stupidity.

Regarding comments and actions within the storyline, we have a few moments when racism is explicitly highlighted, as when Dixon's mother, apparently drunk, advises him to do something to 'get rid of that black guy', meaning Chief Abercrombie. When he explains to her, apparently regretfully, that 'things have moved on in the South', she retorts, 'Well, it shouldn't've', showing us how bigotry is theoretically transmitted through generations within families, thereby also demonising families as part of the agenda to erode familial cohesion. Dixon himself reveals his racist attitude in what he says to Red Welby, saying, 'I got issues with white folks, too', while attacking him, and in his aggressive objection to Chief Abercrombie's replacing of Willoughby, as well as in his 'persons of colour' outburst. In a partial-misinterpretation of Mildred's intentionally ironic taunt, when she asks him about his 'nigger-torturing', and his attempt to prove that he is aware that such labels are outdated, we are being invited to consider the extent of his stupidity in not understanding that new lexis do not evidence any fundamental changes in attitude; that he really believes his virtue is proven by his awareness of the way that 'things have moved on'. Some effort has been extended to showing this side of his character, as well as that of Willoughby's, in order to tell us that the fake efforts to re-educate the bigoted WEs over recent decades, with legislation and speech-policing, have had no effect but to provide them with a veneer to mask their outmoded bigotry.

Besides this 'persons of colour' instance, and the occasion that Dixon mentions the changes 'in the South' to his mother, this mentality is also revealed when he tells Red Welby that he's against the killing of homosexuals, appearing to pride himself on this new, liberal stance. While all of this is intended to show us not only that this bigotry is typical and practically congenital, but also that he is mentally deficient in being so behind the times as to not understand that society has moved on from the speech-policing stage decades before. Incidentally, when Red Welby replies by asking him if he has mistaken Cuba for Wyoming, with regard to the killing of homosexuals, this is a comment about the widespread bigotry which, according to Hollywood lore, exists throughout rural U.S.A., and as if this were common knowledge. This old-world mentality also surfaces in Dixon's slur against Red

Welby's name, when he suggests that it means that he is 'some kind of God-damned communist or something, and proud of it', which would place Dixon in a 1970s propagandised mindset, at the very latest. In this, we might also be being invited to consider how 'progressive' it is to support the transition of our countries into being communist societies, since anything Dixon believes has to be faulty.

The representation of Willoughby takes a slightly different route. Although he is shown to harbour the same attitudes, we are told that, being somewhat cleverer than Dixon, he is restrained by an awareness of the laws prohibiting police bigotry and corruption. We see this when he physically restrains Dixon in the street, during Dixon's first assault on Red Welby, and when he tells Mildred that it is Charlie's word against hers, regarding Charlie's violence towards her, and that there are laws against what she proposes for resolving the case of Angel's murder, in terms of civil rights, a trigger phrase also invoking a 1960s mindset regarding inter-racial strife. His awareness of the power of the law which holds his world together is also illustrated when Cedric mentions that Dixon had 'tortured a guy in custody', to which he replies, 'There was no real evidence to support that'. The ugly incident of Dixon's torture of a 'NWE' man is an example, alongside Charlie's domestic violence, the rape-murder of Angela, the rape-murder of the veteran's female victim, and the potential, near-future murder of the veteran by Dixon and Mildred at the close of the storyline, of events outside of the storyline. These four incidents, all examples of extreme violence perpetrated by cold-blooded 'WE' people, with specific racial overtones in Dixon's case, are apparently intended to add to the catalogue of such 'WE' crimes without upsetting the style of the movie, and its mostly sedate storyline, which helps to maintain the appreciation and attention of the aesthetically discerning portion of the audience.

Otherwise, Willoughby's apparent bigotry is evident when he explains to Mildred, 'If you got rid of every cop with vaguely racist leanings, you'd have three cops left', as if he were making an excuse for it. To this, he adds, as part of the comedy camouflage, and to compound our shock at his acceptance of such bigotry, 'and all of them are going to hate the fags'. His delivery of this as a typical police department joke is intended to show us that such bigotry is so endemic as to have been normalised in the police department and the locale, while the offhand way that Mildred, during her television interview, mentions that 'the local police department is too busy going around torturing black folks to be bothered doing anything about solving actual crime' is also a clue to how common or commonly accepted such behaviour is in this town, and, by extension, all such towns in the southern States. In fact, alongside Willoughby's covering up for Dixon's behaviour, the extent to which police department corruption has become acceptable is apparent in the aborted attempt to exert financial pressure on Mildred, to prevent her from being able to pay for the billboards, and in Dixon's mother's advice to him about how to deal with Mildred, suggesting, 'Why don't you just fuck her over through her friends?' Indeed, Dixon takes her up on this, and promptly arrests Denise, who is incarcerated for days, without fanfare, as if this were common practice to which everyone has become inured.

In fact, it appears as if all the problems in the town, until the advent of the veteran, have been caused by Dixon and, despite the assurance from Willoughby that Dixon is, inexplicably, at heart, 'a decent man', we reach the end of the storyline with this still unconfirmed, as he and Mildred set off to commit a vigilante murder. This appears to be a case of misplaced revenge, a motif of shared guilt. But, very importantly, it supports the theme of shared responsibility by association, and collective responsibility, which the scriptwriters have so earnestly tried to convey. This is achieved by explicitly stating as much, in Mildred's scolding of Father Montgomery, Mildred's attack on the police department building, and Dixon's decision to punish the rapist for a crime about which we know nothing. We are being encouraged to treat people according to how we can categorise them, with the main purpose of this being the consideration of 'WE' people as being all as evil as the worst one of them. This is achieved and justified through the very quiet presence of the three 'NWE' roles, and in the instances of Willoughby covering for Dixon, and James covering for Mildred after the fire, where we are shown how the nasty 'WE' people always stick together in the end, this tribalism, despite being natural to all human beings, being an incurable evil inherent to 'WE' people only,



which even extends to the unlikely reconciliations of Dixon with both Red Welby and Mildred. This is a bigoted way of thinking which is a perverse augmentation of the mild trait of community interests, which is natural and inoffensive to all peoples. In its exaggerated form, it is a major tenet of leftism, and it is no surprise to see how leftism constantly tries to portray it, instead, as a trait of rightism. Leftism, in fact, thrives on bigotry, and this trope about collective responsibility supports such an evil cause.

In the case of Dixon and Mildred, however, the belief in collective responsibility is suggested as an aberration of 'WE' thinking, since Dixon and Mildred, both, in their need for revenge, want to take it out on anyone who fits the bill, without consideration of the law. This makes them dangerous, something also intimated in the kind of danger posed by Mildred when she approaches Charlie's restaurant table with the wine bottle, the kind of danger Charlie also represents with his violent and quick temper, and the kind of danger represented by the ignorance and stupidity of these 'WE' people, posing a threat even to innocent people, under the delusion of a misguided philanthropy. However, in line with the mood of the whole movie, Dixon and Mildred's vigilante mission, being portrayed as a bad thing, is only subtly suggested, just in case anyone might make a connection to the fact that this is another instance of the intention to seed the idea that holding people to collective accountability is a good thing.

Ultimately, and what becomes clear in the final scene, Mildred is shown to have much in common with Dixon: their disregard for the law, being mistaken in their judgements and punishments of others, their predisposition to use violence to satisfy their personal sense of justice, and the extent to which their sentiments match. At the end, she confesses to the police department arson, to which he replies, 'Who the hell else would it have been?'. They are so well-matched by this point, in fact, that they are both equally undecided about whether they are going to kill the veteran, as their unpredictably violent tendencies are finally joined and trailed out of Ebbing to be inflicted on the world at large.

The characters' domestic scenes are also calculated to show them in a dismal light, and we are intentionally given extensive glimpses of the home lives of all three main characters, receiving the impression that their lives are, on the whole, worthless and hopeless for being rather sordid and squalid, with a stream of low points rather than any high ones; existences rather than real lives. This part of the narrative intersects, of course, with the familial estrangement one, and it is intended that the behaviour we witness is viewed in that light, as if it were not only a part of our programming, but also part of the cause of the behaviour of these people in their home environments, with the message being that 'WE' individuals cannot coexist peacefully or happily with anyone else; it never works out. While this provides an interesting and fertile context for the character development, it has very little to do with the storyline, and so its purpose as contextual filler can be illuminating as to the existence and purpose of this main Narrative.

At home with Dixon, the simplest of the three arrangements, we find that, although in his late forties, he lives with his mother, she of the short hair and an alcoholic disposition. This is also definable as the absence of a father, though we are not given an explanation for this; the few usual possibilities of death, desertion, or intractably destructive relationships would all serve the agenda equally well. In this situation, we are being told that Dixon is a loser in life, since he is evidently incapable of any enterprise or ambition, or of looking after himself. Furthermore, outside the home, it is apparent that he has no friends either, and certainly no potential marriage partner; as he says: 'I don't got no fancy woman'. In short, he is a failure in every way. This is all alluded to by Mildred when she taunts him with 'Ain't it about time you got home to your mama, Dixon?', at the bar, to which he replies, from the depths of his inebriated idiocy, that he had told his mother how long he would be out, as if he has never progressed beyond the mentality of a ten-year-old. Of course, the familiar way in which curse words are used between Dixon and his mother are also telling of their mentally feral existence, and the same applies to the other two families we are privileged to meet.

At home, Willoughby freely uses curse words in front of his young daughters, displaying a familiarly peasant-like lack of decorum or foresight, while a short exchange between him and his wife, Gabriella, during an intimate moment before he commits his premeditated suicide, although it is happily without reservation or pretence, and light-hearted, is nevertheless illustrative of the base nature of their relationship:

Willoughby: It's still your turn to clean the horse shit out of the stable, you know.

Gabriella: Those fucking horses! They're your fucking horses! I'm going to have those fucking horses shot!

Willoughby: I'll do it, you lazy bitch.

Gabriella: Thank you, Papa... That was a real nice day. That was a real nice fuck. You got a real nice cock, Mr Willoughby'

It is also pertinent that Willoughby and Gabriella so easily leave their daughters sitting unsupervised by the lake while they retreat into the trees nearby to fornicate. Although this is hedged with Willoughby's instructions to them to stay seated, and would not have been frowned upon in any past ages before the present one, this would appear unacceptable and even shocking to the present, snowflake generations, and so does not cast Willoughby or Gabriella in a good light, despite their smiles and giggles. The other way to view this, playing both sides, is how their right to their own carnal pleasures take precedence over their children's safety, which, again, is simultaneously depiction and programming, an invitation to consider this attitude acceptable.

Finally, there is the more complicated domestic scenario surrounding Mildred. Here, we are not only treated to the habitual use of curse words, but also to incidents of physical assaults and heated arguments. We witness the crude abuse, albeit justifiable, which Mildred heaps on the local priest who comes to visit her with peaceful but naive intentions, which ends with her telling him, 'Get the fuck out of my kitchen!'. Such abuse is also dished out in public, as with Mildred's gruesome attack on the dentist, her (justifiable) kicking of two schoolchildren, and her verbal abuse of the television presenter by the billboards. There is also the insulting treatment of James by both Mildred and Charlie, based on his physical appearance, a neat way to let us know the way they judge and treat people, without explicitly citing race in this regard. We also see Robbie slamming his bedroom door, Mildred flicking wet cereal into his face, to which he responds, 'You old cunt!', and the ugly behaviour of her estranged husband, Charlie, who storms uninvited into the house, cursing and shouting, although Robbie is pleased to see him, perhaps desiring to emulate him in every possible way.

Charlie's story also involves the fact that he now lives with a much younger woman of nineteen, a relationship we are invited to consider as deeply unsatisfying due to the impossible extremes of her ignorance and stupidity, of which even Charlie is apparently aware. Allusion is also made to Charlie's violent behaviour, this being the basis of Mildred's decision to separate from him, and a scene develops where he flips a large table over and pins Mildred threateningly against the wall, while Robbie tries to intervene with a knife to his father's throat to prevent any ensuing assault. Although there is an attempt to mask this with the comedy of being interrupted by Penelope asking to use the bathroom, Charlie's lack of temper, and this scene following so closely upon Mildred's flashback to her last argument with Angela on the day she was killed, leaves us with the impression that such events used to be commonplace in their home, while C's apprehension at Mildred's brandishing the wine bottle as she approaches his table at the restaurant, tells us that, according to what we know of Mildred's character, his violence must have been frequently reciprocated. In that flashback, the degeneracy of the family's behaviour is clear, as Angela calls Mildred, 'Bitch!' after Mildred has unnecessarily teased her about borrowing the car, which Mildred then seems to justify by reprimanding Angela for 'smoking pot all day'. Angela then reveals that Charlie had told her that, when she and Robbie were very young, Mildred had driven them in the car while drunk. In this same scene, when Robbie ends up by calling Angela a 'cunt', and after Mildred scolds him with, 'There'll be no more "cunts" in this house', he says to her, 'Are you moving out?', another moment of levity used for camouflaging, allowing the scene to conclude with the car-less Angela storming out,

shouting, 'I hope I get raped on the way!', and Mildred shouting after her, 'I hope you get raped on the way, too!'.

As if this were not enough, the portrayal of 'WE' people as stupid is also commonplace, especially important when applied to Dixon and, less so, to Willoughby. Mildred, being the main female role, is shown only as wise in comparison, while both Penelope and Pamela, although female, are depicted as being as stupid as Dixon, thereby serving the race Narrative over the gender Narrative. In terms of the middle ground, the other males are not particularly stupid, but are generally simple enough to go along with the ways of the town, without the ability to question these, and this includes Red Welby, James, Charlie and Cedric. While Willoughby is shown to be rather wise on occasion, he cannot match Mildred for consistency in this, and his foolishness is shown when he tells the racist joke to Mildred, thinking this would be a clever thing to do, and also when he confidentially tells Mildred he's dying, to which she replies that she and the whole town already know as much. Otherwise, he is merely shown to have poor judgement in his support of Dixon's behaviour. However, a display of basic ignorance is featured in his response to Gabriella's telling him, 'You got a real nice cock, Mr Willoughby', mockingly pretending to speculate whether he has heard this in a Shakespeare play. She then calls him a 'dummy', and says that the line is from an Oscar Wilde play. Although we understand that they are fully aware that the obscene line does not exist in any play, we are being invited to consider how very little of such culture they are aware of; that the extent of their knowledge in this regard is merely the names of the playwrights, such that they are considered, albeit light-heartedly to be uncultured as well as ignorant.

Dixon, meanwhile, is the chief idiot of the storyline, which is obviously sanctioned by his being male. And, the number of incidents are many. He is shown to lack even a modicum of foresight in his recklessness and violent law-breaking, while also, as mentioned, unable to understand the difference between the pretence of political-correctness and the tolerant behaviour it is presumed to encourage. The portrayal of idiocy is also designed to humiliate, and we feel this when we hear that he was kept back a year at the police academy, and that, as he tells Mildred, he 'didn't used to be very good at English at school', while we also see him reading a comic book more than once, supposedly a signifier of his lack of literacy. Indeed, the first time we see Dixon, when he is singing 'The Streets of Laredo', he adds idiotic, shouted interjections of 'mao!', and at another musical juncture, he is listening to Abba's sentimental pop ballad, 'Chiquitita' (1979) on his headphones at the police department while oblivious to the news of Willoughby's death which has just reached his colleagues, also intended to show him in a clownish aspect. The same lack of ability to focus on more than one thing at a time is apparent in a very similar engrossment in Willoughby's letter while the police department building is on fire with him inside it. He is shown in the childish occupation of catching thrown foodstuffs in his mouth, but being unsuccessful in this and looking all the more foolish. He also describes to Willoughby the two civilians who complained about the billboards, not by their names, which he evidently failed to acquire, but as 'the lady with the funny eye, and the fat dentist', and later fumbles extensively for his badge under Chief Abercrombie's gaze when being fired. Another significant moment of idiocy arises when he cannot deduce where the veteran was at the time of Angela's murder, despite Chief Abercrombie's condescending to provide him with a number of substantial clues, since the country where the veteran was at the time is 'classified'. This all conspires to also support the idea of bigotry being congenital, part of a mental deficiency, overriding even the most simple-minded and 'good at heart' 'WE' people, easily prompted into acts of evil.

The two females Penelope and Pamela are included in order to live up to the stereotypical notion that 'WE' women can also be mentally deficient, and this is shown in comical extremity here. Pamela, on whom Red Welby has a crush, meaning that he cannot be especially bright himself, is too stupid to realise she is embarrassing Red Welby in front of Mildred, when she brings in the money anonymously donated by Willoughby to pay for the billboards for a second month, and describes the delivery boy by saying, 'He just looked like one of those fat, little Mexican boys', compounding her tactlessness with a complete lack of awareness of politically-polite speech to describe people; a product of her environment. 'You did real good', Mildred tells her sarcastically, and she responds,

obliviously delighted, 'Did I?'. Meanwhile, the idiocy of Charlie's new girlfriend, Penelope, is shown when she intrudes upon the extremely violent family fight, and proceeds, despite what she witnesses, to ask to use the bathroom. She has a job at a zoo, presumed to be a ridiculous thing in itself, but loses this, and moves on to working with disabled people, whom she refers to innocently as 'the disableds'. We are also invited to be amused by her ignorance of the difference between polio and polo, as she tells Mildred that the quote she had related to Charlie, 'Anger begets greater anger', which she presumably does not understand, was from a bookmark. Being caricatures of almost impossibly idiotic people, even though such people exist, these moments provide us with further light-heartedness in the name of camouflaging the depressing implications of all this.

We might also consider that the case of the murder of Mildred's daughter, being unresolved, as well as Mildred's perception about the police department's apathy, whether justified or not, is an invitation for the audience to also consider this to be an unworthy and futile quest, not worth bothering about, especially considering the difficulties facing those still alive. We should recall that the devaluing of life, in this case, is applied to the lives of 'WE' people specifically, shown to be generally undeserving and without any positive potential. It is also interesting that, although it transpires that the despicable veteran did not kill Angela, he is the same type of psychopathic criminal, confessing as much to his acquaintance. The extramurality of this has the indistinct result that the horror of these events can be augmented in our imaginations as we are invited to speculate, along very specified lines. While we do not know whether Angela's assailants were 'WE' men, we are being told, as Dixon is, that it was someone very much like the veteran, and so a 'WE' man is provided to fit the bill, for Dixon and for us. The other implication here is that such crimes, unresolved, are commonplace, and according to Hollywood lore, in a fit of fictitious licence, are all committed by 'WE' men.

The storyline also momentarily contributes to the Narrative regarding undeserved material acquisition by 'WE' people based on the exploitation of others. There is the merest hint of this in the fact of Willoughby's house, which has extensive land attached, as well as stables with horses - clearly the life of a very wealthy person - with the subtle implication that this is the lot of many 'WE' people, enjoying inherited wealth dating from the days of the slave trade, regardless of the historical absurdity of this, or the reality of life as it is for 'WE' people as compared to that of 'NWE' people; anyone who believes this is only having their own wool being pulled over their eyes, while the same criminals continue to get away with the exploitation of everybody in equal measure, just as they always have. These presumably back-and-white perceptions and tensions surface more explicitly in a few instances, such as when Denise tells Mildred, 'You go girl! You go fuck those cops up!', the cops, of course, being 'WE'. Denise's arrest, as mentioned, is another outlandish instance, intended to support the long-outmoded and easily debunked idea that police in the U.S.A. generally treat 'NWE' people disproportionately badly, which is another instance of expediently invoking not only currently propagated false narratives, but also historical scenarios which were subject to propagandisation even in their own time, and had for many years no longer existed when this movie was made and set. Finally, such tensions are also shown to retain some currency when Chief Abercrombie puts his foot down within minutes of entering the police department as the new Chief, by calling tauntingly and knowingly to the staff at large, seeing that they are all 'WE' people, 'None of you cracker motherfuckers got no work to do?', whereupon Dixon asks the others, in another display of his superficial awareness of politically correct nomenclature, intended to trigger outrage at his hypocrisy, a response of 'Isn't that racist?'.

## Narrative 2: gender

A lot of this Narrative has been covered already as it intersects so easily with the race Narrative in this instance. Suffice to reiterate that, while there is certainly no lionisation of women in this movie, in order to secure the pervasive main Narrative, the men are, as usual, being 'WE' men, demonised and denigrated. It is also worth re-stating that the Agenda dictates that the two genders, as with the

racism, must be polarised, separated and estranged, and that the weaponisation to achieve this usually manifests in the propaganda that all men are inherently, congenitally and incurably bad, as well as weak, stupid and despicable, while all women are good, strong, clever and virtuous, not to mention the fact that both genders have to be portrayed, by way of the programming, leading by example, as being mutually antagonistic and resentful, unable to co-operate or cohabit. It should also be mentioned that the Agenda targets men to be on the losing end of this already-lose-lose situation because they are the ones, in a physical sense, posing the greater threat, just as they have always done, to the plans of the FWO. To explain, and to state a few home truths: they are, generally speaking, more so than women, the natural protectors of the long-term interests of humanity, and they are, despite the lies which Hollywood has preached to the contrary, also the more naturally keen protectors of justice, peace and liberty for all, more than they are selfishly concerned with their own welfare as individuals, and are more apt to notice and fight against injustices on behalf of all other people, and to rebel, on their own and others' behalves, being less apt to tolerate injustice in order to keep the peace; they understand that acquiescing to bullies, blackmailers or mobsters only leads to more of the same. Meanwhile, for whatever reasons, all of this is more the case with 'WE' men; they are even more naturally disposed to these traits, hence the very specific and obvious targeting.

Those who might consider this a so-called 'supremacist' notion need to take a breath and note the following: not only do these positive traits also exist in women and in 'NWE' men, but that these groups enjoy 'supremacy' over 'WE' men in terms of other positive traits. This is the reason that all human beings should be working together, for the protection of all of us, with all of us contributing to the well-being of our global (not globalist) community. It is essential that we are objective about this: it is the traits which are more immediately dangerous to the FWO which are being expediently targeted, those traits which manifest more strongly among the 'WE' male section of global society than in other sections; quite simply, the existence of 'WE' men, in their natural habitats of community, culture and family, is the greatest obstacle to the rapid and easy furtherance of the FWO's plans to further subjugate and destroy the bulk of humanity, and eventually remove all rights completely. Meanwhile, in terms of reprehensible behaviour, the natural predispositions of all men have always been exploited by the FWO against humanity, so that what is intended by nature to be a force for the good of all is used as a force for the evil intentions of the few, who are themselves mostly men, and even more compromised than the average person by the satanic forces waging this war against humanity.

It is very regrettable that these things need to be mentioned at all; they did not need to be mentioned in the past, as an awareness of general gender and racial differences, the presence of various strengths and weaknesses, was taken for granted and worked around, as individuals everywhere did what they could to survive under the less focussed boot of the FWO. However, the FWO boots are now fully focussed, just as their gloves are now fully off, the war has been spotlighted and the battle has been brought to our very doorstep, while the issues and weapons in play have been more clearly revealed, which has become our own invitation to address those very issues and weapons just as explicitly; it is our vocation, in fact, to point out the emperor's lack of clothing (including the gloves), because the survival of all of humanity is more at stake than it has ever been.

In this movie, there are also some very specific, gender-related points being made, so it is worthwhile pointing these out more explicitly, as separate from the race Narrative. The most obvious of these, because it provides a context for the entire storyline, and exists from the time before the storyline opens until after it closes, is the rape and murder of Angela. This is clearly a gruesome and reprehensible crime of an unlawful, not to mention illegal, nature, which has been committed by one or more men. We are reminded, quite correctly, that nearly all sexual assaults are committed by men, and this is the context for our entire viewing experience with this movie and, even though the enactment of such a crime is not a part of the movie's timeline, even in a flashback, its presence is constantly felt through the references to the loss of Angela, and Mildred's billboard campaign, as well as the focus on the veteran, at a later stage, who has committed an identical crime against another woman.

The problem with such propaganda is that not only does it do nothing to acknowledge that such crimes in the real world are engendered by a range of consciously deployed policies of social engineering, that crime and criminals are, in fact, created as much by circumstance as by anything else, but also that they are, as with other crimes of finance and governance, as well as all the crimes of social engineering, perpetrated by a small minority of people, especially when it comes to men who are unknown to their victims; the majority of men would consider such crimes to be beyond their ability, as well as beyond their comprehension, and it takes a very damaged or corrupted person to commit them, not least because, just as women have fathers, brothers and sons, men have mothers, sisters and daughters. It is easy to understand, therefore, how the familial estrangement, which has long been utilised as a weapon against us, leads to the committing of more such crimes. Ironically, it is the tiny, elite class among the FWO, men on the whole, who systematically and even ritualistically, commit the unlawful and most reprehensible crime of rape, especially the rape of children, as well as engineer the committing of these crimes at lower levels, by all their 'useful idiots' in the field, those world 'leaders', 'captains' of industry and corporations, and many of those lesser mortals working in the media industry, Media is, of course, one of those essential pillars supporting their disgusting reign of terror and misery, all in order to maintain their satanic hold over humanity and the planet. It is a state of affairs which ensures that the rape and murder, of women and children unknown to their victimisers, is widespread. However, since most such crimes are committed, as mentioned, by members of the echelons of the FWO, they make essential use of their media as camouflage, to both pretend that these crimes are being committed by average, everyday men, and to shine the brightest spotlight imaginable on any cases which do appear to involve those average, everyday men, or any celebrities they are willing to sacrifice, which all helps to facilitate the extensive cover-up of their own such crimes, which brings us back to the premise of our movie.

In short, even though such crimes can be said to be committed by men, this does not logically or scientifically equate with the deranged Hollywood presumption that all men are bad. However, in order to bring the audience's thinking more into line with such a presumption, the other men in the storyline also need to be demonised, so that they can be understood to exist somewhere on the scale of reprehensibility which includes the most egregious of crimes, with rape and murder at the high end. There is some male violence, witnessed especially in the behaviour of Charlie and Dixon, as well as the attack on Dixon by the veteran. Despite the premise of the storyline, the depicted violence is committed primarily against men, which appears to serve two main purposes. The first of these concerns the portrayal of men as being too weak to defend themselves physically, such that Red Welby is easily assaulted twice by Dixon, while Dixon is, in turn, shown to be defenceless against the veteran and his acquaintance. While Dixon also punches Pamela once, the assault by Charlie on Mildred in her house is not followed through; he is interrupted by the ineffectual Robbie, and then Penelope. The weight of numbers in the storyline, then, allows us to view men as both more assaultable and less able to defend themselves, than women, while to these attacks, we can add the unreciprocated flinging of wet cereal at Robbie by his mother, and her assault on the dentist, which shows that Mildred, for her part, can easily achieve her violent objectives, as evidenced in her other assault on the schoolchildren, which helps us to draw parallels between her and Dixon, ultimately helping to define the race Narrative as more important than the gender Narrative. This strong woman motif, which is realised through this weight of numbers, is supported by the fact that the two rape-murders, as well as Charlie's violence towards Mildred while they were cohabiting, are extramural, making for a win-win recipe in which men are demonised as the more ubiquitously violent, as well as being the weaker gender.

There is some further male weakness, a vulnerability, shown in the character of James, in his having a crush on Mildred, as well as with Robbie, who seems distraught when thinking of what happened to his sister, and would tend to avoid thinking about it rather than face it as his mother is able to. He is also opposed to the billboard campaign throughout, which serves as a would-be acquiescence to the inaction of the police and the browbeating of his peers, and a general passivity, not dissimilar to Red Welby's forgiveness of Dixon when they meet at the hospital. At the end of the storyline, in fact,

when we see Mildred saying goodbye to Robbie while he is still asleep, it is an image of emasculation, especially when set against her unquenched, raging desire for violent retribution at any cost. However, Robbie is shown to look up to his violent father, being initially happy when Charlie turns up at the house, while appearing to despise his sister, when she was alive, and his mother. This gives us another showcasing of men sticking together, as well as showing us that he may actually aspire to be like his father. Incidentally, we also discover that Charlie used to be a police officer, when Mildred says of him, 'Ex-cop, ex-wife-beater; same difference', such that his terrible reputation reflects further on the 'WE'-male police department. When added to Dixon's losing his job, we are being invited to presume that ('WE') men losing their jobs in the police department, due to the worst kind of behaviour, is common in this place.

Other male reprehensibility is presented with Charlie's living with a much younger woman, and the dentist attempting to torture Mildred in the dentist's chair, while we should also recall that Charlie and Dixon also insult James for his height, with Mildred's poor treatment of James being less intentionally offensive. Indeed, James himself, in behaviour and appearance, tends to add to the range of wacky eccentricity on display by the men in this town, such that we are even being invited to revisit our own ugly reactions and prejudices towards those who look physically unusual. Perhaps we are being asked to laugh along with Mildred at the idea that James is romantically interested in her, just as we are similarly invited to think Red Welby ridiculous for attempting to flirt with Pamela, while at the same time to regard his snatching views of her over the top of his book as being less than manly, and even existing somewhere on the continuum of rapist behaviour. Incidentally, the fictional story he is reading is Flannery O'Connor's 'A Good Man Is Hard to Find' (1953), a short story set in Tennessee about a family on a road trip who are all murdered by an escaped convict and his two accomplices, containing some of the flavours of this movie, but most importantly that of the idea encapsulated in its title. On a related note, we are also treated to Mildred's extreme, tongue-in-cheek idea on how to deal with crime, which she suggests to Willoughby. Not only does she advocate the keeping of a database on which only male babies would be enrolled, but also an unequivocal death penalty for any of those males, in later life, caught doing 'something wrong', almost as if she were voicing a long-held wish of the FWO, while representing their societal manipulation of women hoodwinked to despise all men in the name of the bogus 'equality' of feminism.

The lionisation of women, meanwhile, falls very much to Mildred, with the stoic Denise also putting in a small appearance. With all other women sidelined, or ridiculed for the purposes of camouflaging Mildred's overall superiority, she is our hero, in fact, and her opposition takes the form of a range of males, whose assaults or resistance she navigates successfully, dealing with Willoughby, Dixon, Robbie and Charlie, as well as scolding the church on behalf of all of humanity, and negotiating James's romantic overtures. She even eventually gains some support and sympathy from Willoughby and Dixon. Most dramatically of all, she fire-bombs the police department with spectacular 'Ramposity', and throughout the storyline is acting for a noble cause, and generally seeking to do no real harm; pains are taken to provide us with other glimpses of her humane, unselfish side, in the gentle moments with the struggling beetle on the window ledge, the encounter with the deer, her response to the dying Willoughby when he coughs up blood on her face, her precaution of calling the police department to ensure that nobody is in the building before she fire-bombs it, and when she says goodbye to the sleeping Robbie. While there are also humane moments accorded the male characters, the weight of numbers is easily on Mildred's side.

Finally, it is notable that, in order to prevent the billboards protest being a non-gendered, or ostensibly parental campaign, the father has been largely removed from the picture. Not only this, but Charlie is opposed to it when he hears of it, while despicably, in the audiences eyes, citing money as his reason. Perhaps nastiest of all, he also displays a highly vindictive streak when he sets fire to the billboards. We are thus left with the woman alone, her self-assured independence a given, the only one, apparently, willing or able to stand up in pursuit of justice against the men who raped and murdered her daughter, and against the man she perceives to be preventing this. It is the woman in a minority of one, willing to rail against the evil of the entire male world, no less, and writ

so large here that it almost matches the effectiveness and pervasiveness of the race Narrative. Our tin-foil hats off to you, Mildred!

The priest, Father Montgomery, is an interesting case. Although his appearance is inserted into the storyline only incidentally, this is in order to illustrate that significant premise of the movie, regarding the righteousness of tarnishing all members of a societal subdivision with the same brush, which in this case works primarily towards the gender Narrative, as well as the anti-traditionalist and race Narrative, but also supports a more general contention: that it can be applied to any identifiable societal groupings, thus implying a political purpose. While it might be argued that such diminishment of individual enfranchisement and accountability would work for and against all sides, there is a problem with this, since all forms of media are controlled almost entirely by the FWO and serve collectively as its mouthpiece, ensuring that only one side and one agenda is received by most people for most of the time, such that the demonisation or lionisation tends only in the FWO's preferred directions.

Unfortunately, humanity's natural inclination to join or ally with groups is exploited to engender the belief that one's opinions can neither be mixed nor one's own. In order to achieve this, the individual needs to enter into a state of psychological and cognitive paralysis, and to yield all individual will to a dictator or inflexible ideology, which makes living under mendacious and corrupt regimes, such as we do, more endurable for those who sacrifice their individuality in this way. This ugly truth is camouflaged by the ideal of putting a friendly, co-operative face on it, bestowing false confidence through the notion that one has taken the right side and is justifiably opposing out-group people, which is all the easier if they can be identified, ironically, as being part of a group, in order to dehumanise them. Thus, while the message coming through from the scene with Father Montgomery would appear to be that being part of a group is a bad thing, as soon as this ideology is deployed, it facilitates the very behaviour it vilifies; since what is propagated by the FWO are false values, relying on lies, inequality and violent coercion, those who support the said vilification are themselves allying themselves with a group ideology. This results in the need to demonise groups selectively, as well as obscuring the idea that the accusers are also part of a group; the in-group are multi-factional and 'liberal', compassionate in their concern for a broad range of selected, social issues, while the out-group are simply 'right wing, fascist' politicians.

It should be mentioned that the joining of, and joining in with, groups perceived as having the most power, due to personal fears and insecurities, speaks of extremes of spiritual, moral, academic and psychological weakness, akin to the primitive mentality of the police officers who tried to murder Rodney King; none of the campaigners, or whatever one might call them, in support of the morally bankrupt ideologies favoured and propagated by the FWO, would be voicing their opinions if they did not believe they were part of a stronger grouping or a majority; their weaknesses equate with cowardice and betrayal of the worst kind, and in order to be able to live with themselves, not only can they not afford to apply other than stunted, infantile and perverted logic to their programmed sloganeering, but they also need to cling to the undefined and unqualified notion that they occupy a moral high ground alongside others in the 'moral majority', which allows them a shortcut past logic, thus defining their ideologies as religions.

In her tirade against Father Montgomery, Mildred cites a Californian (where else!) law which renders all members of a so-called street gang morally and legally culpable for the actions of any other member of that gang (which is itself identical to street gang ethics). The crime she then cites as having been committed by the members of the church gang is the rape of children, thus stating, without any ambiguity, that Father Montgomery is also culpable, which is to say guilty, of this crime, which will always be disgusting and reprehensible, regardless of the FWO's efforts to legitimise it while simultaneously and 'cleverly' decrying it. This works to demonise the church, which is to say traditional community life and culture, those of 'WE' people, rather than all others, being an obstacle to the Agenda, as well as the 'gang' of all men, particularly the 'gang' of 'WE' men, with the message being that no man is innocent of the rape of children, regardless of his actual innocence. The other 'gang' implicated in this accusation is the police who, like the church, are, from what is presented in



this movie, also 'WE' and male, so all police officers, particularly those who are 'WE' and male, are also all guilty of the infractions of the few among them. This is the movie's clever way of extending the reach and definitions of its propagandistic Narratives, serving to polarise humanity ever more severely and destructively. This is ideology taken to an incredible degree of abstraction, while also playing along with the kind of logic which people are being 're-educated' into; speaking of which: the idea of shared culpability has deep roots in China, the home of the commune, where throughout history, punishments, including death, were inflicted on innocent people because of crimes committed by other members of their household or village. It is also very easy to see, among the regimes and civilian 'social justice' advocates of current 'WE' countries, behaviour and non-thinking identical to those of the darkest years of China's so-called Cultural Revolution of the 1960s, albeit applied exclusively to society rather than also to industry and agriculture, and I think we might agree that that was neither a progressive, in the true sense of the word, nor a happy time for anybody on either side of the group-think line which divided them, while it is this kind of reductionism which is leading the sheeple of our own time along the same path, bullying dissenters on behalf of Big Brother, for fear of big brother.

## Narrative 3: the cancer scam

Willoughby's dying of cancer is another motif so common to Hollywood product that it would tend to require its own status as a fully qualified Narrative. It is often used in the storyline, as here, ostensibly to endear us to one of the leading characters by way of sympathy, rather than any other physical flaw, but as with those other movies, it makes its presence felt throughout, for entirely different reasons. Willoughby's cancer is mentioned a few times before he is rushed to hospital after coughing up blood, while at another time, it provides the context for his short and violent temper during a chat with his doctor, with an excuse to dramatically add some more blood to the storyline, the sight of which is apparently requisite, like a religious rite. Although Willoughby dies halfway through, he maintains a presence for some time thereafter, through his letters to Mildred and Dixon, made audible with his own voice, serving to remind us of both his cancer and his suicide. Meanwhile, for some apparently unrelated reason, Robbie asks Mildred one day whether birds get cancer, which provides an example, leading by example, of how we should all be concerned with this, and thinking, like him, whether it is a malady which is naturally ubiquitous, and waiting for each and every one of us. And this is a way to force the concern even onto those of school-attending age, in the push to normalise the idea of its ubiquity, even beyond its horrifically extreme prevalence in the real world. When Mildred replies that 'Dogs do', she seems to be confirming his worries and ours.

There are a few things about cancer which have to be stated explicitly at this point, all of which illustrate why its narrative is so prolific among Hollywood products. Firstly, its rates of incidence have been steadily increasing, in real terms, over the past century, so that it touches everyone's life in one way or another. Here, it should be added that the demonisation of the sun as a cause is largely unfounded; a sensible amount of exposure to the sun is a necessary health supplement, in fact, while sunglasses are intended to prevent the health benefits gained from exposure of the eyes to sunshine or its reflection, and sun cream is not only designed to block the health benefits via the skin, but also as a carcinogen itself. As an aside, the sun has nevertheless become more dangerous over recent decades, though the reasons for this are not verifiable, with theories ranging from the planet's changing position in the galaxy to weather modification weaponry; what is beyond certain, however, is that it has nothing to do with 'climate change', which, as we have stated, is a perfectly verifiable hoax. The second thing to say is that cancer is an engineered epidemic, facilitated through all manner of toxification and attacks on our immune systems, while providing fodder for a massive and hugely profitable industry. This is money the FWO would not wish to suddenly do without, in its execution of a multitude of secret projects which all contribute to our demise and their own increased wealth, arising from the financial burden placed on individuals, which conveniently also generates more human fodder for the cancer industry. Thirdly, despite the prevalence of cancer and its causes,

many cures have been discovered and used by many individuals, some of which are simple and/or cheap. These, and information about these, are all continuously suppressed, much like the many thousands of inventions, suppressed through the patent scam, which would benefit humanity and the planet in countless ways. Any mention of any of the cancer cures are viciously attacked by the FWO media and their paid 'trolls', while the propagation of the idea that contracting cancer necessitates a raft of overpriced 'medical' treatment is as rampant as the cancer epidemic itself. Meanwhile, no progress is allowed to be made in the 'research' into remedies, which is an important part of the cancer propaganda, and whereby there is a side-scam running in asking individuals to donate to charities supporting cancer 'research'; no doubt this scammed money goes towards the kind of cancer-related research which only supports and perpetuates the status quo.

The constant showcasing of cancer works to impress upon humanity their imminent mortality and the normalisation of the disease. It is a clear case of utilising the Tarot effect whereby, as mentioned, Hollywood serves as a great deck of negatively inclined tarot cards, constantly re-shuffled and dealt, almost as if this were the way Hollywood scripts originate. And if anyone remains naive enough to ask you, in defence of their precarious world-view which is constantly crumbling under the onslaught of their own cognitive dissonance, in their 'wisdom', as if the thought had not crossed your own mind at any time, 'Why?', it so happens that the cancer scam is as illustrative of the answer, and comes as close, as any of the scams or Narratives, to serving the interests of the Agenda, quite literally, in fact, since a cornerstone of the Agenda is the requirement to massively decrease the global population, concomitant with advancements in technology and AI which render humanity largely redundant, until the self-selected few remain to lord it over a much-diminished slave caste. It is obvious that many Narratives feed into this long-cherished Agenda objective, all mutually supporting, to some degree, and all proudly paraded through all Hollywood products. Even though a large global population provides abundant negative energy which interdimensionally feeds those directing the puppets directing the satanic regimes under which we suffer, and even though it makes the widespread and systemic rape of children easier for those people, the time has finally come to pull the plug on humanity, as we reach that desired tipping point where technology can take over from the bulk of the human slaves, although, no doubt, a substantial sex-slave caste, including children, will be maintained indefinitely for that elite. And so, here we are on the edge of that abyss, after all these centuries of struggling to clarify the inconsistencies in our force-fed delusions, with the lethal '5G', or a laboratory-engineered virus or 'vaccine', to be used as the weapon to out-perform all others, its chief purpose being, to make it explicit, to rapidly kill off massive numbers of people with cancer.

Added to this is how we are being programmed to take this state of affairs for granted, taught that human life can be cheap, which has the effect of destroying individual ambition and purpose, and perhaps also adding to the rates of violent crime, the general disregard for the welfare of oneself and others, as well as the rapidly increasing, global problem of suicide, of which Willoughby's is another example, leading by example. We are all on the same path or conveyor belt as Willoughby, and are supposed to be as conscious of this as we are of the equally propagandised notion that our death is the end of us, which, in turn, is intended to augment our fears of both life and death. As Mildred says to Red Welby when he mentions that Willoughby is dying, 'We're all fucking dying!', which is a message clearly intended for everyone in the audience; after all, Mildred has our attention; she is the hero of the hour.

## Narrative 4: familial estrangement

Familial estrangement is another ubiquitous and long-lived Narrative, supporting the Agenda to interfere with social norms which have sustained humanity forever. Destroying familial relationships, between parents and children, and between husband/partner and wife/partner assists in seeding confusion and uncertainty, in individuals and society, making people more isolated and miserable,

and thus more malleable, susceptible, controllable and exploitable, not to mention more prone to illness, medication/drug-dependency, crime, violence and suicide. Not only this, but it helps to diminish the birth rates, with all of this contributing to the ultimate satanic Agenda. This is achieved by dividing the genders, by setting them at odds with each other, by promoting homosexual relationships and deviant, non-familial lifestyles, and by removing children from their parental homes. The latter strategy also helps in providing countless child rape victims for the degenerate, controlling, power-crazed classes throughout every regime around the world.

This Narrative can be seen everywhere in this movie. To deal first with Willoughby, his family life appears settled and happy, so this is soon predictably destroyed with his suicide, at an early point. The other familial disasters are clearly shown in the domestic arrangements of the other two main characters. As mentioned, Dixon lives with his mother, and has no prospects of anything beyond this, while Mildred lives, likewise, with her son, with the loss of her daughter serving as the premise for the storyline, and being estranged from her husband due to his violent tendencies. As discussed, Mildred has a difficult relationship with Robbie, as she also seemed to have with Angela, as confirmed, presumably in Charlie's cruel revelation that their daughter had discussed moving out to live with him, just before she was killed.

Interestingly, we are left to speculate on how Mildred separated from Charlie, whether she was the one to make the ultimate decision and to throw him out, or whether he walked out. Based upon his violence, we are being invited to consider the former scenario. Either way, it appears that she was left with the house and custody of the two children and, even though we are not told whether she was the sole owner or occupant of this house before they were married, or whether any of this arrangement was legally decided, we are being treated to an echo and conscious reminder of the same scenario seen in many movies, where the wife makes the decision to separate from the demonised husband, orders him to leave the family home, and, inexplicably, he does so. This is often depicted without question, as if this were the way of nature, him being not only the congenital criminal deserving punishment, but also congenitally less entitled, regardless of the sacrifices he might have made for his family. Such treatment is, of course, as transparent and explicit a programming as any we are likely to meet.

Seeing Jerome and Denise in the bar together, while not telling us anything about the nature of their relationship - we easily assume they are neighbourly acquaintances, since this is the only time we see them together - at least seems to confirm that neither of them is married. There is also James, hoping for a real relationship with Mildred, but definitely unmarried, as are Charlie and Penelope, without children and unlikely to last as a couple. Finally, there is Red Welby, eyeing the young Pamela from behind his book, although he seems also to be aware that she is too idiotic to be a likely prospect for a life commitment, such that any relationship they develop would also be unlikely to be meaningful or lasting. In short, no traditional, happy or stable familial relationship is shown besides that of Willoughby, which is cut short. Again, this is a leading by example, the normalisation of such a societal state of affairs.

## Narrative: other

Finally, there appears to be a nexus of threads here which might be labelled 'religiosity', making its presence felt, as discussed, in the person of Father Montgomery, Mildred's tirade against his membership of a child-rape gang, the siting of the church outside Dixon's house and, most of all, the deaths of Willoughby and the extramural others. We can add to this a few other related incidents. When Red Welby tells Mildred that her contract for the use of the billboards can start on Easter Sunday, for instance, she says this would be perfect, and on that day, almost as planned, Willoughby's celebratory dinner with his family is disturbed by Dixon's phone call informing him of the posters. There is a poetry in this, since Easter is traditionally a springtime death-and-rebirth

celebration, predating its hijacking by the Christian mythology, which subsumed the symbolism with its additional layer of fiction posing as fact. The death, in this case, is Angela's, the angel, meaning the one who announces, the deliverer of the divine message, which in this case makes her the excuse for the dissemination of the propaganda of the movie, while the rebirth or resurrection is the memory of Angela as well as Mildred's return to the world following her bereavement, and she utters her approval of the date just as she is granting a resumption of life to the beetle on the window ledge. We might also look upon the Easter mythology as a sacrifice of Willoughby, already facing his death sentence, and with only a few weeks left to live, for the greater good. Alongside him in this 'crucifixion' stand the two thieves, Dixon and Mildred, with the entire scenario reading as the long-awaited and prophesied sacrifice of 'WE' culture and the great, white evil; when Dixon and Mildred, as Isis and Horus, drive off into the dawn at the end, they are truly entering the abyss, with nothing to lose but without any remaining will to make anything of their respective futures; they have already long been walking dead, perhaps only confirmed as such with the death of Willoughby.

Poetry aside, the other significant moment in this vein is when Mildred gives us some confirmation of her opinions regarding an afterlife. Playing into the fearmongering of the cancer scam Narrative, she is shown to have lost her taste for any so-called spiritual interests some time before, perhaps when Angela died, since we learn from Father Montgomery that she had used to attend the church. However, she is shown to now be decidedly opposed to that institution, and leads by example in lambasting it. There is, therefore, no reference made to the spiritual support or guidance which Christianity might afford some people, as Father Montgomery's peace offering is quickly rebuffed, by which time we are in full sympathy with Mildred's character. In case any of the audience might be of a less institutionalised spiritual persuasion, the moment with the deer, while Mildred is potting some flowers at the site of the billboards, is provided in order to ridicule even the notion of reincarnation, as she makes her beliefs in the absence of any God clear. She tells the deer, albeit uncertainly, that there have been no arrests of Angela's killers 'cause there ain't no God, and the whole world's empty, and it don't matter what we do to each other', adding 'She got killed, and now she's dead forever'. The purpose of all this is to reinforce a notion that death is an absolute end, thus making life itself less meaningful. The audience for this movie are, naturally, those in 'WE' countries, although not those of other religious convictions; this idea would have no effect on them, and no other religion except Christianity is lambasted by Hollywood, since it is expedient to both remove the potential of its reassurance to its adherents, as well as to continue to exploit or weaponise the naivety of followers of other religions as another force brought to bear against 'WE' peoples and cultures. Christianity has long been a target of the FWO for the additional reason that it remains a socially cohesive factor, by dint of its historical longevity in the European psyche, the erosion of which is, after all, what this movie is about.

# 4

# Blade Runner 2049

2017

## the storyline

In a dystopian Los Angeles in the usual near future, bioengineered humans, indistinguishable from humans, but possessing super-human strength, produced by industrialist Niander Wallace of the Wallace Corporation, are integrated into human society on Earth and off-planet, working without complaint in a range of jobs. The current series of replicants are different to some earlier models, who had open-ended lifespans and a rebellious nature. Those were produced before the 'blackout', a collapse of Earth's ecosystems in the mid 2020s, during which most of the data which constituted that world was lost.

The protagonist, K, is employed by the police department as a blade runner, whose job is to hunt down and kill any older replicant models, although he is, himself, a replicant, but of the newer variety. K lives alone in the vast city, with a holographic female, Joi, for company, who, thanks to a new innovation, is now able to accompany him outside his apartment. We first see K on a mission to eliminate an older replicant, Sapper Morton, hiding out as a maggot farmer in the vast agricultural lands beyond the city. After killing him, K discovers an ossuary buried next to an old, dead tree by Morton's farmhouse. When the bones from the box are analysed, and after it has been established that they belonged to a woman who died in childbirth, K discovers a microscopic serial number on a crack in one of the bones, revealing the possibility that replicants may possess a reproductive ability. This is a highly incendiary revelation, and K is sworn to secrecy by his boss, Lieutenant Joshi, and is asked to further erase all evidence of the discovery, leading to his mission to find the child born to the replicant.

K then encounters a series of clues leading him to the whereabouts of the miracle child's father, Deckard, a pre-blackout blade runner, and is remotely monitored or assisted along the way by Lieutenant Joshi and Luv, Niander Wallace's psychopathic, replicant assistant. Lieutenant Joshi is hoping to discover the miracle child in order to destroy it, while Luv is hoping to discover the miracle child for the WC in order to learn the secret of replicant reproduction. K's first stop is The Wallace Corporation, where he runs a DNA check, which alerts Luv, who shows K a video from 2019, of Deckard's first interview with Rachel, the miraculous mother, replicant 'niece' of Eldon Tyrell, the creator of the first replicants. The next stop is Gaff, a retired police officer who had worked with Deckard during the same, pre-blackout time, who only tells K that Deckard retired and, if still alive, would probably be living alone. We are then introduced to Mariette, a member of an underground revolutionary group of replicants, now masquerading as a prostitute, who is asked by her leader, Freysa, to find out if K knows anything which could help their cause. As such, K is now being monitored by three interested parties. K returns to the farmhouse and finds a date carved into the base of the dead tree. This date has personal meaning for K, and he is shocked at the childhood memory it triggers.

After Luv steals Rachel's bones from the police archive, Lieutenant Joshi panics because this means the secret of Rachel's pregnancy could be leaked. She later gets K to tell her about one of his false childhood memories, and he tells her about the one which had been triggered by the date he had found carved into the tree. This concerns a toy wooden horse, which had an inscription on the base, and which some other boys were trying to steal from him. Running away, he hid the horse and was beaten by the boys, though he kept the horse's whereabouts secret. Next, K checks DNA records using the said date, and finds that two people, a male and a female, with impossibly identical DNA, were born on that day, and that the records show the girl to have died of a genetic disorder, and the boy to have disappeared. During this research, acting almost like his conscience, Joi queries him about his childhood memory, letting us know that the inscription on the base of the toy horse was the date carved into the tree. She says that she always knew he was special, and suggests that this coincidence is why; that he may have been the surviving male child born to Rachel.

K travels to the location of the orphanage where the two children were housed, in the vast waste-processing area outside the city. There, he discovers a large number of children being used as slaves, dissecting items of scavenged trash, and driven by a scolding, bullying overseer, of whom the children are evidently scared. At the point at which the overseer presumptuously tries to sell a child slave to K, K reveals his police identity and asks about the mystery child of nearly thirty years before. As the slaver takes K to where he keeps his records, K recognises the building from his memory of the toy horse. After they discover that the pages covering the period K is interested in have been ripped out of the ledger, K notices an ashtray on the table decorated with the horse's head, which seems to prompt him to investigate the part of the building he thought he recognised. Working from memory, he finds the place where, in his childhood memory, he had hidden the toy horse, and is shocked to discover the horse to be there, and so now, although the memory turns out to be false, he believes it to be a real one, reinforcing his suspicion that he was the male child born to Rachel.

K then visits a memory designer, Dr Ana Stelline, in an attempt to discover if his memory is implanted or real; the mission has now become an entirely personal one. She analyses his childhood memory and confirms that it is a real one. However, she also confirms that real memories can be used as implants, although this is illegal, so K is hardly any further along in his quest, but now seems to believe even more that his is an authentic memory. At this point, K is arrested for going off-task, and brought back to the office to face Lieutenant Joshi. His deviant behaviour, corroborated by a psychological analysis, would mean his own termination. He tells Lieutenant Joshi that he has found the missing child, then proceeds to describe his hypothesis, without confessing that he believes himself to be the child, and tells her that the job is done, meaning that there is no danger of the child being discovered. In her relief, but without asking for details, she gives him two days to realign his psyche before another analysis.

Upon arriving home, there is a sexual interlude as Joi synchronises her image with the body of the replicant prostitute, Mariette, as a gift for K, after which Joi dismisses her, but not before M manages to plant a tracking device within K's clothing. With nothing to lose, and driven by the mystery, K decides to escape with the portable Joi. As she requests, he deletes her from the home system, so that her memories and knowledge of him will be deleted, in an attempt to avoid detection. When he breaks her antenna, Luv is immediately alerted to the fact that he is escaping, and sets out to hunt him down. An analysis of the toy horse reveals that it came from the site of an old nuclear accident, which is Las Vegas (though its name is never mentioned), and K sets out for that now-abandoned town. Meanwhile, Luv visits Lieutenant Joshi to find out where K is. Lieutenant Joshi tells her that K has destroyed all evidence of the miracle child, then Luv kills Lieutenant Joshi when she cannot tell her anything more, and uses her computer to locate him.

Following signs of life in Las Vegas, K discovers a small colony of bees. Then, wandering among the ruins of the Las Vegas entertainment area, he is drawn to enter a prominent building, an old hotel, presuming, perhaps, that the bees are being kept by someone living nearby. Inside, he

navigates a tripwire, which confirms that someone is living there. Deckard appears with a gun, but is not interested in K's questions, and a fight ensues, amidst which old holographic recordings of Las Vegas entertainers, including Elvis Presley, play intermittently, mostly silently. Finding that K may not have come to kill him after all, Deckard invites him for a drink, and they discuss the Rachel episode in 2019. Deckard reveals that, after escaping the city, he intentionally lost touch with Rachel and, in order to protect them, did not learn the whereabouts of their miracle child.

Luv's Wallace Corp battalion then arrives to take Deckard away for questioning, while K, knocked unconscious, later wakes up on the floor with Joi gone, and Mariette sitting nearby, along with other members of her revolutionary group, who seemed to have been staying in the same area. K is introduced to Freysa, who confirms that she was instrumental in hiding the child, and that it was a female; that K is not the miracle child. She asks K to join them.

Deckard wakes up at the Wallace Corporation, and Niander Wallace asks him where the child is, also mentioning that they do not know whether Deckard is an inferior type of replicant. Realising that Deckard has no information, and after Deckard rejects the offer of a new Rachel, Niander Wallace decides to remove Deckard to an off-world location to use other technologies to extract any semblance of information he might have regarding who had helped hide the child. Walking through the city, K encounters a monumental Joi hologram advertisement, and she interacts with him like a stranger, using phrases that his own Joi had said to him. He has decided to take up Freysa's offer, and to sacrifice himself for a worthwhile cause. He attacks the convoy transporting Deckard out of the city, causing the car holding a handcuffed Deckard to crash-land on the sand by the perimeter wall. K defeats Luv in a fight to the death, but he is mortally wounded. K releases Deckard and takes him to meet his and Rachel's daughter, Dr Stelline; since Deckard would now be listed as drowned, he would no longer be hunted, now making such a meeting much safer. They arrive at Dr Stelline's research facility with snow covering the ground. K gives Deckard the toy horse to give back to Dr Stelline, because it was her own memory. K lies down in the snow and dies, while, indoors, Deckard finally meets his daughter.

## Narrative 1: transhumanism

This agenda point, aspects of which have proliferated in Hollywood since 'Metropolis' (1927), is intended to assist in the normalisation and furtherance of the possibility, based on the Tarot effect, that at some point, human society will benefit from being generally improved and physically enhanced using technology; 'more human than human', as Mariette says, a reference to the first movie. However, the objective is only anti-human in the extreme, the aim being to make humanity largely redundant, except for the small, remaining, slave population, to serve all the nefarious indulgences of an elite few. As long as the Narrative is bought, it is hoped, there will be no resistance to the incremental introduction of transhumanism, which, in fact, works hand-in-glove with any Narrative dedicated to population reduction. In short, neither you nor your descendants would be present to enjoy any of the potential benefits which such advanced technology might bestow.

In this movie, physical enhancement is illustrated, for example, by Niander Wallace who, although blind, can function better than the sighted people around him, using the airborne group of small, fishlike devices which can even relay to him what others are thinking. People are similarly assisted by a range of less biologically-integrated technology in the pursuit of their work, in the forms of weaponry, transport, observation and leisure. It is the drone, with its x-ray camera, paired with K's car, for instance, which discovers the buried ossuary, and it is a weaponised drone controlled by Luv which attacks a gang of bandits surrounding K when they bring his car down on his approach to the orphanage, this while she is enjoying a manicure carried out by a man wearing a pair of goggles which presumably allow him a kind of microscopic vision to carry out his own task. Luv and K control their drones using spoken instructions, and there are other occasions when this technology

is used, allowing that transhumanist foot a little further in through the door; computers in an array of everyday equipment, which can respond faultlessly to spoken instructions, even when these are sometimes unclear or colloquial, speaks of a sophistication which would easily pass the Turing Test, while the important case in point is the ability to respond in a way which suggests understanding. However, the movie already sports far more impressive technology in the nano-microbiology used to produce replicants. In the case of the lesser technology, though, as with K's self-driving car, the intention is that we will relate to these as being practically a reality, although not yet commonplace, in our own time, thus bridging the gap between technologies in our own experience and those of a transhumanist ilk in the future.

Generally speaking, everyone is shown to be highly dependent on a range of technology, though the most striking one is Wallace Corporation's Joi, a holographic female companion with advanced artificial intelligence capabilities. We are not presented, however, with any truly hybrid people; rather, there are distinct divisions between the categories: human, replicant and hologram, with the additional indication that there are sub-categories, or generations, of replicant. What is striking about this array of personhood is the extent to which they are all accepted as sentient, sharing the spaces and interacting easily with the others, as if the replicants and holograms were simply new human arrivals from another place. This leads us to the other main purpose of this Narrative, which is the devaluation of human life, another idea to which we are supposed to be becoming accustomed. The contempt we are being taught to have for ourselves is clarified by Luv when she scolds Lieutenant Joshi, calling her a 'tiny thing', mentioning that conservative thinking is what holds back progress: 'In the face of the fabulous new, your only thought is to kill it, for fear of great change', then adding, by way of showing humans to be a primitive form of person, 'You can't hold the tide with a broom', perhaps thus referencing the 'Fantasia' sorcerer, and the human role as the uncomprehending apprentice.

Furthermore, as Joi muses in K's ear, playing the part of a Pinocchio-like Conscience, 'Mere data makes a man', as if the human DNA code and that of holograms or replicants, are of equal value. Indeed, at the same time that we are being made familiar with the idea that the three categories of person can function together in human society, we are also exposed to a catalogue of types of denigration or abuse directed at all three categories, showcased most extremely in the brutal killing of a new model of replicant, undertaken in the coldest of blood, by Niander Wallace. This is done in order to accustom us to the idea of such abuse committed against the human form and human individuality; humans as disposable property. While some of the abuse is directed at holograms or replicants, we are supposed to read these as human, nevertheless, and, as a result, such behaviour towards people, the absence of any value attached to individuals or their basic rights and freedoms, is normalised, intentionally striking us as being less offensive with each instance.

The Joi hologram is, broadly speaking, a sexual object, a type of pornography, and is marketed as such, with naked versions of Joi projected outdoors throughout the city. To reinforce the point, there is also another occasion when a sexually-provocative female hologram advertisement is projected near K as he stops to eat. Meanwhile, the archived holograms seen in Las Vegas, while they include chorus-line girls, also include musical entertainers, again, not free agents but service providers, intended, in this case, to appear like ghosts from the past, to remind us of our mortality, and the fact that the world we have known can or will be removed and forgotten. The Joi innovation, as with the replicant ones, is also used to devalue humans and the human experience by comparison. After all, what would make humans special while the artificial people are shown to be equally capable of the same range of emotions and sensations, besides enjoying greater capabilities, as with Joi's intelligence and replicants' physical strength and perfection?

With replicants already superior, except in the realm of reproductive ability, in order to narrow any remaining gaps between holographic AI and humans, we are shown K's genuine fondness for, if not romantic interest in, his Joi and, at her first outing, her experience of the rain in contact with her skin. This is not possible of course, but her AI seems to do a good job of approximating what this would look and feel like, translating this, for her, into a realistic, if not fully physical, experience. And when



Joi tells K she loves him, just as she is about to be terminated by Luv, the possibility is being introduced that such feeling is genuinely possible for AI, but this audacious suggestion is masked, even subliminalised, by being superseded by the subsequent moment of her destruction. This point is supported by statements such as 'you have a special lady here', as Mariette speaks of Joi to K, and Joi's autonomy on display at various times, such as when, following her synchronising with Mariette for K's pleasure, Joi tells her, 'I'm done with you; you can go now', and then, even more contemptuously, betraying her ability to feel envy in a most human way, 'I've been inside you; not so much there as you think'. Indeed, Joi is portrayed as experiencing mortality, as a portable-only unit, when K destroys the home-based unit, and the point is also made, in this, that as humans, as with Joi, we are merely the sum of our memories and experiences, as long as we are linked to them by being conscious and alive, the implication being that, thereafter, in the unacknowledged hereafter, we are, even as humans, non-existent, and our ownership of a soul, mere delusion.

Replicants, being one step closer than the holographs to being truly human, are used to evoke the Pinocchio motif, which is a philosophical commentary on what constitutes human consciousness, most explicitly referenced in Spielberg and Kubrick's 'A.I.' (2001) for instance, but invoked here more subtly in order to raise the same point: that there is, in the world of this particular Narrative, no qualitative difference between the human and the automaton, or, at least, that the human would not be superior to an automaton. as Joi says to K, in a further display of artificial and independent intelligence, 'Mere data makes a man: A and C and T and G, the alphabet of you, all from four symbols'. This is often supported by storylines and motifs which glorify the android whilst denigrating the human. In the present case, the resulting message is that we could become physically and mentally artificial to any degree without becoming less worthy, or even less human. The difficulty would thus be whether there is ultimately a congenital difference between the human and people created artificially. This is addressed during the first meeting between K and Lieutenant Joshi: when K observes, circumspectively, that the difference between being born and manufactured is having a soul, she retorts, 'you've been getting on fine without one'. With that out of the way, the difficulty remains, however, that this congenital, albeit hypothetical and metaphysical, difference is a congenital one; the differences inherent from birth would remain problematic even if we were to accept them as being purely physical, because it remains difficult to bridge the gap between human and replicant as long as we are classifying them as separate genera.

In fact, this is the main Narrative point, also underlying the entire storyline, and is thus the main contender for being the chief purpose in producing the movie, with the neat resolution being the possibility that a child can be born to a manufactured parent or parents. Allowing for a physically human person to have artificial ancestry helps to fulfil the apparent need to blur the distinction between the genera to an ambitious extent, with the usual gritty realism assisting in providing a context which would make such a proposition all the more believable. It is as if the child, so desperately sought, for different reasons, by the three different factions in the story, is truly the holy grail dreamed of in the real world by the movie's producers. The Pinocchio story, similarly, allows, in an equally magical way, for the transition from the manufactured person to the born person, and in Pinocchio's case, we are also posed the same question: what of Pinocchio's soul; of what does soul or human consciousness consist? We are able to interpret that older story more prosaically, however, as a coming-of-age tale, in which full consciousness is gained by the golem through experiencing the trials of life, and learning lessons from, and awakening to the harsh reality of the world, maturing and eventually becoming whole as a result. As such, the story allows for the same nihilistic statement to be made, that the notion of soul can be dismissed, not being a congenital attribute, and that any approximation of such, besides being a product of our imagination, fears and hopes, is a manifestation rooted only in the physical world. This is precisely why, of course, the Pinocchio story was selected by those controlling Disney Studios in 1940, another layer of shadow drawn over the people living at that time, just as with 'Blade Runner 2049', to augment and align with their experience of a satanically-orchestrated total war; puppeteering in the midst of the apocalypse; rock on, Stromboli.

Part of the magical reality inherent on the Pinocchio story, of course, is the presence of the protagonist's conscience, manifesting in the Disney version as Jiminy Cricket, represented here by Joi; apparently, even replicants can function more efficiently with further AI support (though this is likely to be because K is unable to think fully enough for himself because he is male). Part of the message, of course, is that we cannot function well alone, that we need assistance. This may be largely true of course, being social animals, but in this case, such support does not come in the forms of community or family, but as an artificial enhancement, one to which you can renounce your autonomy, your decision-making and catalogue of memories; you can take advice, instruction or orders from another; you do not need to take full responsibility for yourself, since your conscience is not a part of you. It is a dilution of the self.

The Pinocchio motif is invoked by the very obvious referencing to that story, in terms of becoming real, as in becoming 'a real boy', the android acquiring the same value as the human. This is also signified when Lieutenant Joshi says to K, 'we're all just looking out for something real', and when Joi says to him, in her role as his conscience, 'i always told you: you're special; born, not made, hidden with care, a real boy now', and 'You didn't like her enough to tell her the truth?'. Also, the replicant Mariette (whose name is a clear approximation of 'marionette') chides him for not liking 'real girls'. Meanwhile, before synchronising with Mariette for the sexual encounter with K, Joi says, 'i want to be real for you', and describes herself later as a being 'like a real girl' when exposed to mortality. Of course, it was Pinocchio's aim to be 'a good boy', in order to become real, and this is echoed in Luv's statement to Lieutenant Joshi concerning K: 'I liked him. he's a good boy [...] anywhere a good boy might go?' In the end, we could suppose that K, through his heroic journey, does become more real in some sense, since he has proven himself 'brave, truthful and unselfish', although the transition in this case, unlike Pinocchio, is into death, a replicant death, without reprieve or hope. Since K is the character with whom we empathise most, we experience this fatality with him, a catharsis or a terror, or both, for us, as he dies on snow-covered steps, rather less dramatically than the criminal, Eddie Bartlett (James Cagney) in 'The Roaring Twenties' (1939), with which this moment can be paralleled: the outlaw meets his destiny, becoming real, and that which we are invited to recognise that we are striving towards, apparently, is dying without promise of salvation, a sentiment which has been sounded by Joi in her statement about being 'like a real girl' when becoming mortal, exposed to the new possibility of dying. Such an attribute, although negative, is a human one, thus equating the holographic AI ever more closely with human beings, culminating in our very real sympathy and grief when her life is also terminated; our propensity to sympathise with other humans in fatal circumstances is exploited to elicit the same for a non-human person.

## Narrative 2: race (slavery)

This topic pervades this movie at all levels, and would vie for first place were it not for the fact that it is presumed to refer to the past, whereas transhumanism refers to a more pressing future. This Narrative would usually be rolled out under 'race', intended to stoke up societal enmity and overt or subtle demonisation and denigration of 'WE' people, alongside the general acclaim of all 'NWE' people, and, while that all inevitably feeds into the storyline in this movie, it also proves an ideal vehicle for pandering to received 'wisdom' concerning slavery in our own recent history, by casting replicants in the role of second-class citizens who have been created, and are also being trafficked, off-world, for the sole intention of exploiting their labour. Replicants are clearly little short of being slaves, born into that bondage with no hope of reprieve. It should be noted that no explicit reference to our own so-called history of slave-trading is necessary in order for it to be invoked; the mere hint or suggestion of the existence of slavery is enough to make the issue the overbearing object of subliminal attention for anyone who has been subjected to a lifetime of this part of our history being trumpeted throughout mainstream propaganda media. Of course, it goes without saying that there has long been a great deal of bogus hyperbole, misinformation, omission and selective reporting within this broader narrative, which need not be elaborated on here; suffice to say that whatever

most people think they know about this issue derives from such misreporting, as well as Hollywood products, and that their understanding of it is therefore disturbingly and dangerously faulty.

One of the more interesting aspects of this Narrative is the portrayal of K as a wage-slave. There is a reference early-on, for instance, to his receiving a bonus, for which he is grateful, and with which he purchases Joi, also rather a slave-trading thing to be doing, suggesting that money is as difficult an issue for him as it is for all the wage-slaves in the real-world; we can easily feel our own predicament in this portrayal, which rather seems as though our noses are being rubbed into the bare facts of our own lives lived at the mercy of the slave-owners engendered by the satanic system under which most of us, as well as all our forebears, have long since laboured. It is clear that we live in a feudal system in which slavery has been cleverly disguised, but which has been becoming increasingly more punitive and exploitative since the furthering of the Agenda was turbo-boosted early in the twentieth century. In this case, a correlation between the slavery Narrative and K's situation is neither direct nor necessarily intentional, but the wage-slave point is being made in order for us to understand that, being a replicant, he lives as a second-class citizen, which translates, however, in the Blade-Runniverse, into slavery. It is also notable, possibly unintentionally, that, true to life, as a slave, in order to sustain his own life, K works blindly to oppress fellow citizens, fellow slaves, a painful reflection of our own situation in terms of the purposes prescribed for police and military forces, not to mention social 'services' and bureaucracies, everywhere in our own world, where such agencies work for and towards an anti-human agenda, while in the movie, it is only pre-blackout replicants who seem to be targeted.

We are presented with a hierarchical society, with natural-born humans accorded the highest rank, especially those who have been permitted to emigrate off-planet, with replicants as second class citizens both on- and off-planet and, finally, AI holograms such as Joi, who seem to be newcomers to human society, coyly suggestive of the weaponised migration agenda, and who would appear to have no value or rights, being manufactured or duplicated at no expense, though still apparently in service to both replicants and humans. The slave status of Joi, being sold as a virtual slave by Wallace Corporation, is proclaimed by her advertisement, which states, 'Joi is anything you want her to be' and 'Joi is anywhere you want her to go'. The existence of Joi, and, incidentally, the old-model replicants, is thus used to reinforce the hierarchy, which we are supposed to read in racial terms, being reminded, of course, of unequal societies based on race classification, in our own experience and history. This also neatly ties in with the normalisation of 'multicultural' societies, which we are supposed to perceive as a natural and inevitable development. Also, when asked why she is not working for Niander Wallace, Dr Stelline, a replicant, replies to K, 'I take my freedom where i can find it', adding, 'Replicants live such hard lives, are made to do what we would rather not'. Also, later, among the rebellion group, Freysa tells K, 'i know that baby meant we are more than just slaves. [...] We are our own masters'.

And there is apparent an awareness of this hierarchy among all three classes, paralleling that of the transhumanist Narrative. To reiterate: at their first meeting, Mariette says of K, for instance, noting that he has a Joi companion, that 'he doesn't like real girls', although by this, she means replicant girls, implying that replicant girls are superior to, or ought to be more desirable than, holographic girls. We are also shown the way that K, as a replicant, is generally despised by the humans who have not qualified for off-planet emigration, since there is extreme hostility to his presence among colleagues at his own place of work, as well as fellow-inhabitants of the building where he lives. In his first meeting with Lieutenant Joshi, she tells him, 'I've known a lot of your kind, all useful, but with you, I sometimes forget', meaning that she easily mistakes him for a human, while her use of the term 'your kind' is an example of the worst kind of 'othering' produced by many Hollywood characterisations of racist 'white' people throughout its own history. This is a constant factor in K's life, it seems, and an explanation for his retiring nature and attachment to Joi, who, as his own slave, cannot betray him or treat him badly. Joi also ponders the inequalities, musing, 'the alphabet of you, all from four symbols. I'm only two: one and zero'. Also, following the synchronisation with Mariette for K's gratification, when she tells her, 'I'm done with you; you can go now', this further adds to the flavour of a culture which subsists on using and misusing others without any semblance of respect,

especially between the different classes of people. Further, as another piece of disposable property, K tells Joi, regarding his possible status as a naturally-born replicant, 'If that were true, I'd be hunted for the rest of my life'. Pushing his growing suspicion, she then says, 'It's o.k. to dream a little, isn't it?', to which K replies, 'Not if you're us', by which he means non-human, by which he also means slaves. This is well understood by K, as is evident when he says to Luv, after she has provided him with access to the pre-blackout record of Deckard and Rachel's first meeting, 'Please thank Mr Wallace for your time', a barbed comment intended to insult, reminding her that she is, like him, a mere replicant slave.

The 'racist' behaviour is recognisable only from other fiction we have viewed; we are supposed to read the inter-person animosity, between humans, replicants and holograms, as a parallel to the Hollywood and other mainstream media portrayal of racism directed by 'white' people at 'non-white' people, both historically and contemporarily, and even if we have never witnessed such behaviour in the real world, its portrayal in this movie and elsewhere can easily have its intended cumulative effect upon the blinkered- and weak-minded, allowing them to believe that this is something which really happens in their own environment, or, at least, is endemic while just of sight. Of course, if such negative inter-racial behaviour ever does manifest in the real world, whether directed at or directed by 'white' or 'non-white' people, its cause is never discussed, since true debate is always a danger to leftism. Regardless of how it is generated, though, it is often stoked and augmented by controllers in suits sitting far from the fray, relishing the ongoing Hegelianist agenda in the service of another divide-and-conquer endgame. What is most impressive about this Narrative is how it is used to mirror its counterparts elsewhere, allowing it to glide by inconspicuously with somewhat plausible deniability while fully invoking the Narrative intertextually, since there is practically nothing portrayed in the way of inter-racial animosity as we have been trained to recognise it in the world of fiction.

There is an overt portrayal of slavery, however, in the guise of the orphanage children, who are used to dissect the endless mountains of trash for the benefit of their owner. For this role, he is wearing a Victorian overcoat common in 19th century Britain, which is perfectly apt because it would have been part of the wardrobe of many British and North American slave traders, and so is evocative of those days. It is also straight out of the iconic musical movie 'Oliver!' (1968), which portrays a children's orphanage workhouse very reminiscent of that shown here. Since the reference is so obvious, and the image of the forced labour so explicit, it is downplayed by making the inmates both 'WE' and 'NWE', and both male and female and, although the girls are not shaven-headed, the shaved heads of nearly all the boys, as well as the slaver's comment that 'It's work that moulds them into a child worth having' (paraphrasing 'arbeit macht frei'), are helpful in introducing a modicum of death-camp reference, just in the way of a little oblique inter-narrativity, for good measure. The other striking feature of this portrayal is the very 'NWE'ness of the slave owner, who also sports a headscarf in order to reference an African-ness, rather than a non-African 'NWE'ness. However, although it is not mentioned in the movie, the name of his character is Mister Cotton, an overt reference to the use of slaves in North America on cotton plantations, clearly indicating the intentions of the scriptwriters. It is almost as if the flavours of these Narratives, even if they were dubiously and counter-intuitively applied, can be dropped into the mix without contrivance, allowing them to function as free-agent signifiers waiting to be perceived and applied according to a viewer's prior received 'wisdom' about where they belong. However, this is never the case; the ingredients are never so casually injected. Rather, in this case, the ethnicity of the slaver is also consciously used to mask the more important imagery of the existence of the slavery itself, artfully and tastefully hedged.

The orphanage also includes a number of adults who assist with the supervision of the working children, and they are all shaven-headed white men. This is included not only in order to whiten the slaver's 'NWE'ness, but also to reinforce the popular notion that there are practically armies of people (unsurprisingly, non-existent) fitting this description in a number of 'WE' countries, who are of an extremely racist and hyper-nationalist persuasion, modelling their beliefs and image on violently murderous nationalist factions in 1930s Germany, while the same is true of the fictitious

portrayal of prison gangs of 'white' men in USA prisons, again with the emphasis on the threat and execution of irrational violence. This shaven-headed, white male appears almost as a motif in this movie, as in others, since we are subjected to the same imagery a number of times. There is the gang of shaven-headed boys who attack K as a child in his memory, some hostile neighbours in K's home building, the three police guards, among other hostile police officers elsewhere, brought into Lieutenant Joshi's office when K is arrested, the arresting soldiers arriving with Luv in Las Vegas, and the members of Fraser's army who, although ostensibly fighting for basic survival and a noble cause, serve to add a presumed militant and threatening edge to the group. Finally, both the police scientist and the Wallace Corporation records office receptionist are also both shaven-headed, 'WE' men, used as a reminder of another perceived notion, gleaned from many other movies, of cold German bureaucracy and nefarious clinical research, the cold face of officialdom.

This latter point leads us to more predictable demonisation of 'WE' people generally. For instance, despite the deceptively 'non-racial' appearance of the movie, Lieutenant Joshi, being 'WE', is an unappreciative user of the slave, K, while K is a 'WE' owner of Joi. We should whenever Luv is shown to be psychopathically brutal, such as her killings of Rachel, the police scientist, Lieutenant Joshi and Joi, as well as the bombing of the vagabonds attacking K, also remember that she is 'WE', and callous in the manner of her impossibly even more sedate, 'WE' manager/owner, Niander Wallace, who is also shown needlessly killing a newly-born replicant on a whim, apparently a prerogative of slave owners of the Hollywood ilk. Niander Wallace refers to all replicants as his own progeny, though he also evidently sees them as slaves, explaining that 'Every leap of civilisation was built off the back of a disposable workforce', adding, regretfully, 'We lost our stomach for slaves, unless engineered'. He is also able to couch the terms in more palatable euphemisms, in the manner of most of the propaganda we are subjected to, such as 'We make angels in the service of civilisation'. This line betrays his role as a 'WE' slaver, which is also strongly linked to colonisation by his ancestors, both in the movie and in the real world, as he comments on the restriction on the numbers of slaves which can be produced, His conception of replicants as property, to be thought of like cattle, in the same way that all people of the earth are thought of by the contemporary slavers / planetary controllers in the real world, is evident in this obsession with multiplying their numbers; his statement, 'I cannot breed them. So help me, I have tried' displays a propensity to corruption in the name of acquiring power, revealing an edge of mania in his personal stake in the expansion of humanity through slavery, intended, of course, to mirror the attitudes of 'WE' slave traders during the colonisation of North America, claiming, regretfully, 'I took us to nine new worlds. [...] We should own the stars!' and 'We need more Replicants than can ever be assembled. Millions, so we can be trillions more'. A traitor to her kind, and a convert to this expansionist, corporate mantra, Luv evidently agrees, saying to K, 'what a gift, don't you think, from Mr Wallace to the world? the outer colonies would never have flourished had he not bought Tyrell, revived the technology'. In addition, when the captured Deckard asks her where they are going, she replies, 'Home', thus including Deckard in her reference to replicants, and establishing their outcast status as belonging off-planet, the colonies where they were primarily intended to live out their bondage.

There are also a number of less overt signifiers of this Narrative, often in the form of unassuming lines or images, supporting or embellishing the theme of slavery and a desire for freedom, such as the use of replicants for sexual gratification at the hands of either humans or replicants, shown at the glass-walled brothel at the outdoor eatery where K first meets Mariette, and when Luv is meeting a client looking to place an order for replicants off-planet, telling her, 'You can customise them as much as you'd like', and 'I wouldn't waste your money on intelligence, attachment or appeal, unless you'd like to add some pleasure models to your order', 'pleasure models' being the favoured euphemism from the first movie. There is also the apparently innocuous and fleeting scene of Luv, being 'WE', having her manicure done by an aged, 'NWE' man. It is also worth pointing out the brief assault of Mister Cotton by K; although apt for the scene and K's purpose, the intention is that we log this as another one of many incidents, although these are witnessed only in works of fiction, of 'WE'-on-'NWE' violence.

The existence of Freysa's replicant rebellion group is another reflection of what we know about slave-trading societies. She explains to K, 'A revolution is coming, and we are building an army. I want to free our people. If you want to be free, join us' [...]. Dying for the right cause is the most human thing we can do.' As such, K becomes a kind of unsung Spartacus in the fulfilment of his mission and making that ultimate sacrifice, while the group also plays a convenient, parallel role in reminding us of the trumpeted false narrative concerning the widespread presence of covert, militant, extremist groupings ready to usurp our own civilisation in the real world, waiting around every corner, and for the perfect moment to strike when our guard is down.

## Narrative 3: CCH (climate change hoax)

There are a number of occasions when the climate change hoax is invoked, an ongoing and multifaceted showcasing of yet another strain of widespread cognitive dissonance, coupled with the perpetual trauma experienced by those who subscribe to this particular religion. It is as if the multiplication of deceit and mendacity within which we are forced to exist is part of the agenda to create psychological stress and dissociative personality disorder on a global scale, such that people become more malleable, suggestive and exploitable. Of course, this is just a secondary benefit of the hoax, whose main purposes are obfuscation of persistent and widespread deployment of geo-engineering technology, and of other geo-destructive operations, ever-increasing, unlawful restrictions on human liberty, large-scale theft of land and resources, and theft of our personal resources of time and labour.

Common to many movies of the dystopian tendency, the story takes place following a human-engendered, environmental catastrophe of global proportions, with the intention that such a thing is to be believed as being possible or probable, and imminent. The signs of this in this movie include the trademark Blade Runner motifs of persistent bad weather and pollution, and urban over-population, and the fact that any humans who are eligible have chosen to relocate off-planet, implying that the environmental collapse evident in LA, is a worldwide phenomenon. The 'blackout', as the catastrophe is called, although brief, apparently resulted in extreme changes in human society; conveniently for the Narrative, there was no reduction in the global population, but there was irrevocable loss, and there was, presumably, a need to enforce changes in the way things were organised thereafter. Although we are not informed about the cause of the blackout, we are left to infer that, being so devastating and widespread, it was caused by humanity and its propensity to make poor, short-term decisions. The portrayal of such instantly world-changing events are used to evoke trauma, reinforcing the supposed threat for which the CCH provides, while also often creating an expectation that human society would be instantly organised differently; it is the excuse, another would-be false flag, which could usher in the kind of totalitarianism depicted in such movies, a shortcut to an extremist feudal arrangement, between humanity and its presumed owners, for which the latter have been striving for millennia. Meanwhile, the archived holograms seen in Las Vegas serve to add to this idea, appearing as ghosts from the past, to remind us of our mortality, and the fact that the world we have known can or will be removed and forgotten. This might be taken as a poetic or philosophical statement, and would be laudable as such, on an artistic basis, but its truer intention is to make a point about the vulnerability of our society, its constant exposure to potential extinction, and using very recognisable embodiments of nostalgia, things which are already a fading part of history, to make the idea appear real, thus reinforcing the trauma of such a possible and absolute loss.

The emphasis on over-population is tied to the CCH since the CCH relies partly on the notion that humanity is currently adversely affecting the global climate, as shown in the depicted, abnormal weather of Los Angeles, including plenty of rain, and even snow, implying that the cause of the blackout is related to current issues being touted by the CCH as evidence for its veracity. This would not sit so well with the storyline, however, since Niander Wallace desperately desires to add infinitely

more people to the replicant population, and any areas we see outside the city are empty of people, but there are storyline justifications carefully inserted to account for these: Niander Wallace wishes to swell the replicant ranks only off-planet, and the areas outside the city which we are allowed to see are being used for intensive farming, garbage disposal, or are supposedly too polluted to sustain life, such that there is nowhere left, in fact, to accommodate the population unfortunate enough not to have been allowed to emigrate from the planet, and it is apparent that emigration, due to the deplorable state of the planet, is something every individual would naturally desire. In fact, the polluting behaviour of humanity - it just cannot seem to help itself - is shown to be unceasing, as the endless garbage deserts are constantly being added to, and we are to presume that such bad behaviour has now been exported into the vastness of outer space. The overcrowding is embodied in the city itself, which is portrayed as being incredibly dense, with apartment blocks so packed full of people, and with apartments so insufficiently small that the residents hang out in the hallways, though we are shown this only once, in K's apartment building. Furthermore, the farmlands outside the city are shown to be practically endless, and densely packed with all space being utilised, as the greenhouses - there is no land, as such, exposed - are lined up edge to edge, with no spaces at all between them. Any food, of course, is being grown in artificial environments, greenhouses, presumably because the air is too toxic to support natural sun-soil interaction.

Besides this, we are provided with comments regarding the extreme difficulty of growing anything, either animal or vegetable. For instance, Sapper Morton is growing worms as protein, presumably for food, although these are 'Wallace design', so although able to reproduce, would seem to be artificial, a nod to the idea that replicants might also be able to reproduce one day. The tree at the farmhouse is long-dead, and when Mariette sees it in a photograph, mentions that she has 'never seen a tree'. There is also Badger, the man who provides the analysis of the toy horse, who is amazed that it is made of 'real wood', telling K, 'You are rich, my friend. You could buy a real horse with this', but we are also left with the impression that if such a horse were available, it would also be artificial: 'like Wallace shit', he adds. There is also the matter of the bees, presumably real, which surprise K when he encounters them, since Las Vegas is supposed to have been irredeemably polluted in a nuclear accident, making it an ideal place for both Deckard and the replicant rebellion group to hide out. The presence of the bees would imply that there are plenty of flowers also growing somewhere, if it were not for the fact that the bees are being artificially fed, and care is taken to illustrate this. One might also speculate that the gratuitous inclusion of the bees could refer to the self-sustaining community which is the revolutionary group hiding out nearby, though to interpret this fully, it would have to be admitted that the life of bees is an apt metaphor for communists living as slaves under a monarchical dictatorship.

Finally, there is also the matter of the compromised immune system of Dr Stelline, intended to portray true humans as frail, and generally less useful than replicants, with the added bonus of allowing us to believe that such congenital illness is an acceptable part of being human, as if the epidemic of frailties people are now born with were natural, and not the most obvious result of generations of weaponised air, food, water, and 'health care'. While this serves to normalise such health conditions, there is also a suspicion, perhaps, even in the dullest of minds, that this has something to do with the pollution created for us to live within and labour under, while pollution, of course, has been intentionally conflated with the CCH in the minds of many. Dr Stelline's condition is presumed to be a natural consequence of the environment, and thus is also directly related to the CCH itself.

## Narrative 4: gender

While tangentially related to the familial estrangement Narrative which it supports, this can always be easily discerned, in its single-minded objective, as a Narrative in its own right, clearly and fatuously dividing the genders (of which, for clarification, there are two) into the lesser, demonised

and denigrated male, and the greater, lionised female. This Narrative is so overtly an integral part of propaganda across all forms of media, and a salient element in practically every Hollywood movie, that to not recognise its existence, or its purpose for what it is, would be to live in a delusion beyond rescuing. As mentioned, the modus operandi is generally to take every opportunity, from the writing of the characters and plot, to every detail of characterisation, to demonise and lionise accordingly, and in as extreme a way as is feasible (and often beyond what is feasible). In this movie, for instance, although the male protagonist is allowed to undertake and fulfil the heroic quest, he is generally surrounded by an array of more powerful females in various guises of authority over him, with K, actually the hero of the piece, subservient to them all in as many ways.

The said females include: Lieutenant Joshi, who is his manager at work, and holds the power of life and death over him; Luv, who uses him to discover D; Freysa (a female with a male name, and also, for good measure, being a Middle Eastern type, reinforcing the entire post-1980s 'Arabs as terror-group threat' narrative), the leader of the replicant resistance group who invites him to work for their cause, which he ultimately does; Mariette, who tries and manages to manipulate him sexually, also working for the resistance group to track his movements; and finally Joi, who, although wanting only the best for K, is basically a form of personal tracking device, and as such, an ultimate betrayal, even though cover is provided in the form of her best intentions. For instance, even when switched off, Joi is able to track and process all available information relating to K, evident when she asks him, referring to Lieutenant Joshi, 'You don't prefer your madam?' 'You were listening?' he replies, and she answers, 'Maybe'. This example provides a modicum of support for the tired message that the (two) genders should be mistrustful of each other. This is compounded by the fact that Joi is not uniquely dedicated to K alone; care is taken to show us that she has been mass-produced, and any given copy of her would behave to anybody as she has behaved towards him. This is most poignantly illustrated in his interaction with the monumentally-scaled Joi hologram advertisement, following the death of his own Joi. Not only does she have blacked-out eyes, in order to make her appear demonic and inscrutable, she also says to him, a stranger now, 'You look like a good Joe', a name we had supposed K's Joi had used for him alone, but which we now learn is a part of her programming, and probably used for all the men who purchase a copy of Joi. Of course, 'a good Joe' would also imply that he himself is not necessarily unique; that he is one of many Joes, all taken for the same ride by the same lines and expressions of endearment; that men who own Jois are collectively labelled as such, almost as a derogatory term. Also, since there is no uniqueness in their apparent bonding, it also serves as a neat way to devalue male-female relationships.

Of course, we cannot forget Deckard's affair with Rachel, thirty years before, and the love he still bears her. For her sake, and that of their child, he has hidden out in Las Vegas for thirty years. Such commitment and fondness cannot be shown to be reciprocated, however; such a thing as a woman feeling any fondness for a man is difficult to find among Hollywood products. As it is, Rachel is long dead, so we can only be witness to Deckard's undying devotion, while the note of fondness evinced by the replicated replicant Rachel, who is presented to him at the Wallace Corporation, is noteworthy for its inevitable insincerity. The scales are so clearly unbalanced when the true love of men for women is used to put them at another disadvantage, subject to another weakness; in all these storylines - romantic sideline narratives are still a staple of Hollywood - there is no such disadvantage or weakness applied to women, unless, perhaps, they are not 'real', as when Joi tells K that she loves him just at the point of her 'death'.

There are other fleeting moments of subservience to female authority, such as when we see Luv having her manicure. This is being carried out by an aged man, and he appears to be crouching uncomfortably on the floor for this work, or at least below the level of Luv, who reclines in an armchair. Of course, in the real world, one pays for such services, and either gender may serve the other gender on the basis of payment for time and labour, but it should be remembered that when it comes to Hollywood, every detail of every scene is carefully considered; the resulting elements are very conscious choices, with the indictment resting on numerical imbalances; you know what is going on when there are more such scenes of male subservience to female authority than otherwise and, since this is one of the Narratives of the movie, this example is easily interpreted as being



contrived to support it. Furthermore, with the authority figures of Lieutenant Joshi and Luv, any male staff under their jurisdiction also support their high status as females, including, for example, the police scientist and the Wallace Corporation records office receptionist.

With regard to numerical imbalance, there is another minor moment when we witness Dr Stelline at work designing a memory of a child's birthday party. The party is for a young girl so the group of children are predominantly female: six girls to one boy. Again, this would remain acceptable, a perfectly normal and everyday occurrence, if we were not dealing with conscious choices made for nefarious political ends. This is, again, illustrative of how the influence of the weight of numbers can be brought to bear on apparently innocuous events in the service of propaganda. A subtle message can be repeated over the long or short term, going entirely unnoticed, and be so apparently random, a part of the wallpaper, that it provides for plausible deniability, though all the while it is doing its work, embedding images and messages into the minds of millions, ultimately, though piecemeal, changing what is acceptable and what is expected in the real world. In this example, the female superiority is one of numbers and, possibly coincidentally, would almost parallel K's own experience in the storyline, subservient, as he apparently is, to the five mentioned females, while we could add a sixth to the list if we include Dr Stelline, who designed K's childhood memory of hiding the toy horse, which is now being used by Luv to manipulate him. Incidentally, Dr Stelline is another example of female superiority, since she is presented as a creative genius, and able to call the shots in her own career. It is easily noticed that a highly creative attribute is seldom applied to male roles; they are, as stated previously, generally more likely to be typecast, as in this movie, as brutish, useful only for carrying out brutish, dirty or dishonest tasks.

Finally, there is a display of physical superiority during the Wallace Corporation attack on Las Vegas and Deckard's arrest when, after shooting three arresting soldiers, K is easily taken down by Luv with a number of kicks - of course, there is no need for a gun, which those cowardly, weak males depend on - calling him a 'bad dog'. Although Luv is shown to be lethally violent towards both males and females practically in equal number, it is worth noting that the females she kills include Joi and the Rachel clone, both very easily destroyed without any possible resistance, whereas the equally-easily defeated men include K, Deckard and the police scientist, all of whom are physical and could potentially put up some resistance, but who are all dealt with without breaking sweat, although K and Luv are then equally matched for the final showdown, and end up killing each other. However, these last deaths are also imbalanced in their portrayal, since Luv is killed by K in a face-to-face encounter, in order to show, although we have no sympathy for her, the act of a man killing a woman, while K is left to die from the gunshot wound alone, some time later. The heroic warrior woman, now a staple in Hollywood, as opposed to the removal of such roles for men unless they represent an evil cause or are going to suffer defeat in battle, is a mandate confirmed by Freysa, who, upon revealing to K that the lost infant was female, and that he is not the mystery child, tells him that 'she will lead our army'. We are encouraged to pity K, perhaps, for his naivety and presumption, and to question our own assumptions, with the implication that these may be preconceptions, that the key focus of the storyline would turn out to be K, a warrior, a male hero, rather than a female one.

## Narrative 5: familial estrangement

This Narrative has long been a staple of Hollywood product, pushed since the early 1960s through the fictionalised normalisation of adultery and 'free love', and the denigration of marriage, human reproduction and normal parenting (meaning: two parents, one of each gender, in a collaborative, committed, long-term relationship). At all costs, Hollywood cannot portray a normal family life, the implication of which is procreation, unless this is to be subverted by some catastrophe or betrayal, or paraded as being comically ridiculous. In this movie, quite predictably, there is no real departure from the degeneracy agenda in terms of family, but there is, in fact, an attack on its integral place in the human experience. Obviously, this is because the family, which basically boils down to the one

ideal principle of producing and raising children who are psychologically healthy because of their familial circumstances, is one of those cornerstones of human civilisation which, along with the existence and ongoing development of 'WE' culture and peoples, stands in the way of the satanic Agenda. The uniqueness of the ability of humans to reproduce is compromised by advancing that ability to replicants, while the evident ability to produce these advanced replicant models, with or without reproductive capability, is an automatic devaluation of such capability among humans. This theme, in fact, underlies the entire plot, as a part of the transhumanist Narrative described previously.

Thus, sexual activity is reduced to a kind of Weimar Republican debauchery or cheap commodity, provided and consumed without any particular fanfare or value; nobody is love-partnered, except for K and his hologram, and even this relationship is obliterated in an instant under Luv's corporate boot. Since any male-female relationship is suggestive of procreation, evoking, in fact, the idea of family, and since Hollywood and its Narratives always mitigate against the possibility of such a notion, such cannot be allowed to manifest within any storyline without subversive purpose; increasingly, such relationships will only be allowed to feature, for instance, if they are to be torn down. K and Joi's relationship is allowed to flourish in the storyline, firstly because procreation cannot result, and secondly because Joi is easily removed and, as stated, existed for the purposes of devaluing such relationships through their artificiality and duplicability, and for the purpose of sowing the idea of mistrust between the genders, since Joi is also a tracking device. The only other relationship referred to is that of Deckard and Rachel, who have been estranged since their child's birth thirty years before, and, even when this is momentarily resurrected with the presentation of the Rachel clone, she is bloodily slaughtered in Deckard's presence, providing a clear statement, if one was needed, of the Hollywood coven's views on would-be normal relationships. Besides this, the relationship options which include replicants and holograms would tend to reduce the entire purpose to one of mere companionship or sexual gratification; the relationships would appear to be entirely self-serving and shallow, the purpose being to teach such a lack of values to the viewer. Of course, if you have a relationship with a Joi, you are actually still alone. The argument is therefore being attempted that, regardless of our interactions, and the relationships we appear to have with other people, we do remain ultimately alone.

Furthermore, subversion of the idea of procreation, and, more especially, of children being raised by parents within any traditional context, is also featured in the existence of the orphanage, both in the present and in the past of K's artificial memory, which, along with the momentary image of the fictitious child's birthday party memory being created by Dr Stelline, is the only time children or childhood are featured, with the motif being, as per the Disney and Hollywood tradition, a separation of children from parents and parental influence. After all, as Deckard states to K, 'Sometimes, to love someone, you gotta be a stranger'. It might be recalled that Disney's release of 'Pinocchio' (1940), its second feature-length animation, is sandwiched between those of 'Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs' (1937), 'Dumbo' (1941), and 'Bambi' (1942), establishing this motif for all Disney movies thereafter. The message is reinforced in Niander Wallace's comment about having millions of children, meaning replicants, manufactured children, those produced without any semblance of a relationship; it is apparent that all the adults in the storyline are isolated, unattached individuals, and that procreation is not a normal feature of the civilisation portrayed.

In effect, until he is disillusioned by Freysa's revelation, K is on a quest to discover his parents, ultimately a futile one, leading to his own death, an 'infanticide', in fact, at the hands of his own true parentage, Wallace Corporation, in the guise of Luv, with the plot suggesting a Hansel and Gretel theme: the dispensability of children by placing them in the way of mortal danger; and the way that K seems to be prompted to follow the clues placed for him to discover, much like the following of a trail of breadcrumbs through a forest, or of a ball of yarn through a labyrinth. And of course, there is a Gretel, K's would-be sister, Dr Stelline, who was abandoned at the orphanage by her mother, Rachel, and later forever removed from any possible familial contact - with her father, in fact - by her compromised immune system, just to ensure that the reunion at the close of the storyline remains rather less than consummated. Meanwhile, the child-parent conflict is taken to more literal

lengths in the fight between K and Deckard at their first meeting when both we and K suspect that K might turn out to be his son. Finally, when Freysa tells K that he 'must kill Deckard', this is understood to be an instruction to kill his father, since this is just prior to confirming for K that he is not Deckard's son.

## Narrative: other

One of the more prevalent extra-Narrative features of this movie is the large number of suggestively esoteric allusions which, individually and collectively, tend to allow the status of the movie to be raised to that of a work of art, something which is only augmented by its stunning visual content. Many of these allusions are tied to elements of the storyline, illustrating and extending the meaning of these in order to add depth and layers of meaning, allowing for a broader appreciation of this work by a discerning audience intended to include people of many persuasions, and with substance enough to satisfy, as entertainment, not only movie aficionados and artists, but also those of various religious, philosophical and political interests. The work's complexities and detail populate a whole additional layer of texture, warranting and inviting multiple viewings, and it would appear that it was always intended to join the category of those movies which generate a cultish following which lasts for decades, while dating only slowly, much the way in which the first movie did. It would also seem, therefore, that when the production team started on this project, they not only took account of the elements of the storyline and audio-visual effects of that first movie, but also of its wider cultural impact. The fact that it became a classic, and even a so-called cult classic, is one of the things which defines it as much as its artistic impact and influence, and a similar destiny was evidently intended for this sequel. Of course, this kind of staying power and ability to inspire fanatical and widespread appreciation, from generation to generation, would be a very attractive attribute for any movie, since every one of the Hollywood products is loaded with propaganda; the effects of a popular movie become multiplied by being watched generally more often, by more people, and for more years, than most movies, achieving that ever-desirable reach throughout society and through time, becoming a cultural mainstay due to its reputation and broad appeal.

Although this would appear to be something movie producers might wish for all movies, there are relatively few movies which can or do achieve this. However, this would also be an inevitability fully taken into account, since any given movie may remain inaccessible or unappealing to some sectors of society, who may not enjoy its style or other surface content; no single product has total appeal, so that even the most popular cultural fetishes will pass many sectors of the population by. Although this movie is not a particularly high-brow piece of work, it would be intended to catch the attention of many of those who are immune to the same propaganda embedded in more populist products, those people who might consider themselves thinkers, for instance, living outside, or at the more esoteric end, of mainstream culture. This is the ultimate purpose of such a movie, mopping up in the societal areas where populist culture has fallen short, since the aim is to cater for all tastes, to enjoy maximum coverage for the propaganda upon which the FWO subsists.

Part of the interest is generated in this movie, as mentioned, using an array of ingredients intended to intrigue the more insightful viewer and, as is common to such content, it often remains ultimately unresolved, in the manner of all true art, making it, almost paradoxically, satisfying to those of such a disposition. In fact, the way that these ingredients are scattered throughout the movie seems to parallel the 'breadcrumbs' being dropped for K to follow, complete with red herrings and cultural references. Indeed, this allows us to feel more keenly what K does in his quest, our own journey being one of making sense of the storyline and all its said allusions. These are allowed to fall just anywhere, but are rather evenly spread, generating the kind of texture only achieved by design, by practised masters of such craft.

One of the more evident categories is that of religion, albeit narrowly Abrahamic; the movie emanates from such a culture, after all, so that these references become both existential and historical; this history is invoked, however, in order to allow it to transcend history itself, referring to this, our near future, and eternity beyond it, the destiny of humanity, an ambitious theme to even allude to in any explicit way, though this movie is carefully crafted to be able to carry such a weight. This biblical referencing is most often espoused by Niander Wallace, who more than once, for instance, mentions angels, an enigmatic reference at any time, saying, 'We make angels in the service of civilisation' and 'There were bad angels once. I make good angels now', in reference not only to old and new models of replicants, but also alluding to biblical fallen angels, part of creation mythology. This also references a Luciferian belief system, to which the FWO is dedicated, lending the storyline lofty and universal proportions, while also establishing that the post-blackout age is significantly different from what went before. It is a way of highlighting the possibility that the world we know can be overturned for a new order in which the corporation becomes that-which-is-left-of-God. Niander Wallace also refers twice to Luv as an angel, with 'An angel should never enter the kingdom of heaven without a gift', and 'The best angel of all, aren't you, Luv'. Angels, of course, work in the service of that-which-is-God, or even of a false or imposter god, a role Niander Wallace is apparently establishing for himself, as the creator and 'parent' of a new strain of human. We are to deduce, therefore, that both that-which-is-God, and the angels in the service of that-which-is-God, are malicious, demonic, and self-serving, so this becomes a closure in the Darwinist endgame in which that-which-is-God is both re-cast and exposed as being entirely without compassion, interested only in aggregating power and glory to himself alone. Meanwhile, Niander Wallace's ambition is evidently linked to such ideals and usurpation since he states that, before he kisses the newborn replicant on the mouth prior to gratuitously slaughtering her, in a situation rather suggestive of the myth regarding the betrayal of the Christ by the apostle Judas, 'We could storm Eden and re-take her'. We are also in biblical territory with Luv's comment to K when he first inquires about the mystery DNA, when she refers to this as 'another prodigal serial number returned'.

Turning to the main theme of the storyline, the search for the magical mystery child, we are on apparently hallowed Christian ground, signified in one of the first lines by Sapper Morton, who before his inevitable demise, almost apostolically tells K, 'You new models are happy scraping the shit because you've never seen a miracle'. He is referring to the secret, evidently known to an inner circle of the replicant underground, as well as suspected by Niander Wallace and Joi, that an impossible conception and birth has occurred. We therefore read Rachel as a mother-Mary figure, and Deckard as an elusive father-Joseph one, the latter having been traditionally written out of the original Jesus story following the miraculous birth. In addition, the three different parties searching for the mystery child also puts one in mind of the three religio-astrologers in that story. However, Deckard would also be a Jacob figure, considering his consort's name, for Rachel, in Genesis 30, is the barren wife who becomes miraculously pregnant and bears a son, so we are invited to consider the gravity of a distinguished lineage in respect of this motif, and, in skirting this Hebraic ground, the early supposed history of the forebears of the people who established Hollywood itself. We might also consider how thirty years have elapsed since the impossible birth, and how this signifies the revelation and beginnings of the ministry of the Christ in Christian mythology, a coming of age story also echoed, of course, in the impossible conception of the Pinocchio tale.

We are also in the domain of the Moses story, of course, and thus in that of prophecy, as well as more Old Testament gravitas, with the child and its identity being concealed at birth. This is clarified by Joi who, in her role as conscience, tells K, 'You're special; born, not made, hidden with care', rather consciously echoing the Christian reference to the Christ as being 'begotten; not made'. The said birth-and-miraculous-infant theme manifests in Niander Wallace's ostensibly Herodian quest, not, in this case, in order to destroy the child, but in order to study and own it, for apparently worldly purposes, but, although Niander Wallace is shown to possess an apparently Herodian disposition, his role, not least because of his biblical fascination with the miracle birth, allows us to simultaneously read him rather as a would-be worshipper of the child famed by prophecy, an astrologer who has travelled far to pay homage to it, although in this case, the prophecy is merely Niander Wallace's long-held hopes for a clue to replicant reproduction. Furthermore, since the

miracle child would be the offspring of his own 'immaculately' conceived progeny, his position as imposter god is reinforced by this appearance of an apparent Christ child, although his consideration of this as being the key to greater power, or the potential satiation of his vanity, along with his callous disregard for anyone who would stand in the way of his ambition, simultaneously reveals his Herodian aspect, working with the Flavians - here, the police - for his own inter-worldly advancement. On this quest, in his interrogation of Luv, for example, he asks, 'Can you at least pronounce "A child is born"?' and 'There is a child. Bring it to me'. It has to be remembered, however, that the virgin birth, featured throughout many ancient-world cultures, among other features of Christianity, extensively pre-dates that mythology, and enjoys the status of a human archetype in symbology, adding to the potentially powerful effect of the movie on a viewer's psyche, and thereby arguably elevating the concomitant propaganda to mystical status by association.

Another religious feature of the storyline is the comment on false belief, delusion exposed as the futility of faith, through K's growing belief that he is born instead of made; a faith in what cannot be, the divine birth as a result of an impossible conception, then followed by his disillusion, and the undoing of his religious conviction. Sapper Morton's comment reminds us that miracles are provided for those who lack faith, and K is inducted into this perspective via his own, personalised storyline, navigating a Minoan labyrinth which has been built for him, in a search for himself, simultaneously Theseus and minotaur, believing himself to be that impossible, possibly hybrid, offspring, but understanding, in the end, that although he was not the miracle child, this did not prevent him from believing that such a child existed. And yet, doubt permeates this conclusion because the clues leading him there were fabricated; he was fed his religion, manipulated by its external construction, so that we are left with a faith as blind as ever; a nihilistic perspective whereby belief in miracles would be exposed as naivety if it were not for the fact of the child's birth which, of course, must be granted in the name of the religion of transhumanism, our main Narrative here.

Religion, of course, is also personified as conscience, as Jiminy Cricket is with Pinocchio, and as Joi is with K. Representing conscience as an entity separate from ourselves is what equates to religion, the intrusive, nagging creed in one's ear, ostensibly and deceptively well-meaning, but carrying threat, coercion and domination as luggage. Religion is belief in the hologram, with all its obvious limitations, as reality, the fantasy with which one builds a relationship and addiction, and ultimately another prison. In covering its materialistic and earth-bound tracks, religion also purports to be concerned, presumptuously, with the state of one's eternal essence; one's soul. To many, the mention of this word immediately suggests religion, however ironic that would appear to be in the light of day; it is religion which had hijacked, for most of humanity, for most of our recorded history, the inner voice of authority on the soul. As such, it was religion which mediated all personal introspection and understanding of an individual's soul, such that, for better or worse, religion became, like an abusive parent or schoolmaster, an indispensable, psychological crutch and, for many people today, this is still the case; despite the rejection of religion by many, nothing has replaced its purposes in the lives of most individuals, while many have retained religious beliefs divested of a dogmatic mantle.

This is part of the reason for the inclusion of religiosity in this storyline, since, despite the onslaught of the even more regressive and degenerate Darwinist religion, an inherited religious dogma still resonates deeply with many people. However, this is apparently only set up, in the movie, in order that it can be torn down; in the end, the corporate godhead is psychopathically flawed and self-serving, the mediating conscience of one's own delegated intuition is destroyed and shown to be a manufactured, reproduced commodity, and we are told, in what Lieutenant Joshi says to K, the protagonist with whom we are empathetically bonding, that we can get along fine without a soul, which is soon followed by K's death and, as a replicant, apparent passage to oblivion without redemption. In this, we are to read our own demise, bleeding out, to no purpose, on the steps in the snow, in order to invoke, for those of a religious persuasion, the age-old terror of oblivion.

The predicament of the soul-less replicant at the point of death is targeted at those people, all those who have been misled and collaborated in their own misleading; if there is nothing to tell a replicant

and a human apart, especially since replicants have been finally shown to be capable of reproduction, and if a replicant possesses no soul, the questioning goes, how can we be sure that we do? Without the crutch of an orthodox religion, with no values beyond physical survival - a scenario with which these dystopian portrayals are replete - immersed in the presenting-future storyline, the old, nihilistic phantom rises again to haunt us with the terror of mortal doubt, the price which most have paid for entertaining a relationship with religion, either by deferring to it or rejecting it, or in obstinately refusing to consider the eternal issues on their own terms; the opium of the masses simply gave way to the opium of everything else, and the abyss, intact, welcomed us back.

The other area rich in allusion is literature. For example, the Nabokov novel 'Pale Fire' (1962), supposedly a favourite of K's, is shown to us twice, though without elaboration. We could assume that something about this book reflects the storyline or theme, although this is rather difficult to discern, and possibly little more than a pretentious invitation to the viewer to ponder, possibly indefinitely, what the connection might be; a way of shoe-horning in an obscure literary reference for the sake of it. This tongue-in-cheek, wryly comical novel features a long poem written by a fictitious poet befriended by a fictitious, pedantic narrator who has supplied extensive, Proustian notes, most of which concern events surrounding an exiled king from a fictitious country, making up the bulk of the book. In these notes, it is apparent that the narrator entertains delusions of having been a great influence on the poet in his final years, and that he is suffering in trying to prove as much to himself and the reader. Part of that storyline also involves the arrival of the king in the USA and the efforts of the man sent to track him down. While this is partly autobiographical, and while the author was generally concerned with parody as an art form, the chief connection to the movie is the circumstance of Deckard's exile, with K tracking him through a sequence of clues akin to the book's footnotes. This looks, then, to be an homage to the book, with the idea that it can evoke the mood which the movie also aims to. This is also reflected in the inclusion of the repeated 'cells' and 'interlinked', used as markers at the ends of emotional-reaction questions and responses during K's debriefing checks following his assignments. Arguably, this obscure reference in the movie's context is able to augment the hostile and alienating atmosphere of this apparent interrogation, like an inexplicable automaton's ritual. The original text would also appear to support the movie's overall tone, as the poem precedes the repetition with the words: 'A sun of rubber was convulsed and set; / And blood-black nothingness began to spin', before moving on to the repetition: 'A system of cells interlinked within / Cells interlinked within cells interlinked', while we can almost glimpse the future K in the movie of 2049 in the strangely isolating words following this: 'Within one stem / And dreadfully distinct / Against the dark, a tall white fountain played'. The notes in the book have little to say about the repetition, however, except that 'one derives logical satisfaction from the 'system' and 'stem' interplay'.

All of this might refer, generally, to the purpose of Hollywood in providing realistic fiction with which a viewer, in consuming it, enjoys suspending their disbelief. This is also akin to the way that the propaganda, evidently bogus, not to mention religion, as mentioned, necessitates the practice of cognitive dissonance, so the work might be a comment on this, as if to underline the power of fiction in our lives, or the overlap between fiction and reality. The fictitious country in the novel is nevertheless reminiscent of societies we are familiar with, while the imprisonment and escape of the king, from a country in the vicinity of Russia, during the twentieth century, may be a comment on the engineered revolution and dissolution of the Russian monarchy, installing a new and brutal regime in its place, mirroring the post-blackout regime in the movie. It might also be intended as a comment on human vanity, the will to create, or to reminisce, with the anachronistic item of the book itself providing for nostalgia. At best, it would be a most approximate and disjointed analogy, and it may simply have been a random idea of one of the movie's production team, but it does help to embed the idea of a near-contemporary, fantastical, parallel world within the texture of the storyline.

Another reference is Kafka, via the name of 'K', the name of the protagonist in 'The Trial', another reference to a labyrinthine misadventure in a recognisable dystopia in which the individual is dwarfed by a crushing, totalitarian bureaucracy. Our own K is therefore cast in the same mould as Kafka's, hunting for clues to exonerate himself in the isolating and pointless yet all-consuming predicament

of his very existence. Joi tells him that he is 'too important for K', as this is not a 'real name', and provides him with a name to match her own. Joe, of course, refers to Josef K., the fuller name of Kafka's protagonist, the surname's initial arguably a reference to the novelist himself. Meanwhile, Joi's name, approximating Joe, neatly allows an alignment of their identities, underlining her role as a Jiminy Cricket, conscience character.

The Joi product also plays a tune each time it is activated, which is Prokofiev's 'Peter and the Wolf' (1936), a symphony with an accompanying children's tale of innocence, in which a boy risks his life to capture a wolf and save its prey. Again, there are approximate parallels to be discerned in this movie, although we are left, again, with the feeling that this is all very circumspetive or unfounded, tempting us to make very general comparisons, between the wolf and Wallace Corporation, from which a duck, Dr Stelline, is saved by Peter as K, who has disobeyed instructions in order to resolve an injustice. Incidentally, Peter in the story lives with his grandfather, another archetypal instance of parental absence, in the manner of both replicants and the overarching Disney motif. Speaking of Disney, there is also a 'Treasure Island' reference, with the line about cheese uttered by Deckard in the manner of Ben Gunn, as someone who has been stranded on a remote island for many years, as Deckard has in Las Vegas. Disney dramatised that story in 1950, happy to comply, of course, with the fact that the protagonist, Jim Hawkins, whom we shall read as K, has no father, and completely abandons his mother for the company of pirates. Broadly speaking, the boy Jim is torn by divided loyalties, as K is between his own interests and those of his employers, the police, and caught up in the labyrinth provided by Wallace Corporation, as the pirates.

If we add to this the implied Hansel and Gretel breadcrumbs or labyrinthian-ball-of-yarn reference, we are being provided with our own trail to follow, one of supporting, loosely related storylines, and K characters in the way of an unappreciated poet's acquaintance, Josef K, and the boys Pinocchio, Peter, and Jim Hawkins, in which the innocence and bewilderment of the childhood adventure of discovering one's identity is clearly intended, in order to illustrate our perennial, existential dilemmas regarding our mortality and relationship with our creator, and questions to which we will not find answers until we reach our journey's end. All of this is rather interwoven with religious connotation, cementing the lofty nature of our viewing experience, almost as if engaging with the movie is as close as we might ever come to considering or resolving such questions.

This rich tapestry is further augmented by the equally-lofty references to the ancient world, invoking by association the ancient understanding and codification of these spiritual themes, alongside the references to more recent history in the invocation of nostalgia for that paradise of innocence lost, in the distant pre-blackout days of the twentieth century, in which the first movie was created. The hotel, for example, is an ancient-world-themed cornucopia of Roman and Egyptian decor, while the immediate environment of the dead city contains suggestions of architectural pyramids and obelisks, besides monumental statuary, for which the ancient world and its religious devotions are famed, while the thick, airborne golden dust helps to provide a Saharan backdrop enhancing the generally biblical theme. Other references include a famous painting by James Turner, called 'Rain, Steam and Speed - The Great Western Railway' (1844), signifying, as it did for the painter, the inevitable transition from one age to the next, and the unavoidable march of technology. A reference to later times comes in the form of the holographic performances by Frank Sinatra, Elvis Presley, and the Las Vegas chorus line women. Being more recent, we are being provoked to consider these as belonging already to a lost civilisation, with the very presence of Las Vegas itself appearing as a flash-in-the-pan of cultural history, all of its shallow, short-sighted diversions intentionally and pathetically dwarfed by the more sublime implications suggested by the storyline.

Regarding those questions, it is also poignant that Dr Stelline is shown designing a children's birthday party, an image instantly recognisable as nostalgic, while also, in its reference to birth, being basic to the overarching question of what makes us human, and what would differentiate born humans from manufactured replicants, with the implication being that it is only accumulated and interacting memories, informing all subsequent behaviour, which would make the difference, and

thus, in the face of manufactured memories, there is no difference at all, besides the birth event itself.

Finally, puzzles also arise with Dr Stelline and Gaff. Dr Stelline's first name is Ana, appearing as an abbreviation of 'anagram', as well as being itself a palindrome. She thus faces in two directions, a kind of Janus, lending her an appropriate twin identity, as suggested for a while by K's discoveries along the trail of clues. It is an ancient name, too, with 'Anu', the ultimate divinity of ancient Mesopotamia, credited with being the creator of the current incarnation of Earth humans in his own image, arguably suggested, relating to her role as a weaver of dreams and thus a birther of identities, and therefore with a God-like ability. Perhaps more enigmatic is the folding of an origami ram by an ageing, ever-taciturn Gaff, in the retirement home. Apparently, this would reference the 'sheep' of the original book behind the first movie, though could also be read as sheep which are being led by a shepherd, replicants as slaves under the direction of Wallace Corporation. The animal being a ram, however, rather than a sheep, would suggest animal husbandry, the procreation of replicants. Basically, Gaff and his origami were always good for wordless but powerful communication through illustration, as if illustrating what is happening, without comment, is all that is needed to carry us on our journeys, individually and as a species, procreating or manufacturing our way into eternity and the stars.



# 5

# War for the Planet of the Apes

2017

## the storyline

This is the third in this movie series, a story resurrected from an original series of five movies (1968-1973), besides a rogue 2001 outing, in the wake of the emergence of advanced CGI. The current series takes place at the present time, and intentionally compensates for some storyline faults in the original series, initially explaining that the rapid development of higher-order thinking and linguistic abilities in apes resulted from scientific research to develop a drug to alleviate mental degeneration in humans, and later that almost the entire global human population is removed by a virus, which removes the power of speech and thought from humans, but to which apes are immune. The previous movie ends with total hostilities breaking out between an isolated, surviving, human group, based in what is left of post-apocalyptic San Francisco, and the tribe of apes who had originally revolted and escaped the local zoo and laboratories, led by the chimpanzee, Caesar, the first to have been mentally enhanced by the wonder drug.

Taking up where the previous movie left off, the human group, following the battle with the tribe, according to the opening text, 'sent a distress call to a military base in the North where all that remained of the U.S. army was gathered. A ruthless Special Forces Colonel and his battalion were dispatched to exterminate the apes'. This storyline opens with a human battalion creeping through dense and hilly forest, preparing a decisive, sneak ambush for Caesar's tribe. The battalion are accompanied and assisted by traitorous gorillas, used for heavy carrying and scouting, known as 'donkeys'. They communicate with the humans and each other using a more expedient sign language, though we also see that the apes in this dystopian, immediate future also apparently have the ability to speak a pidgin (English) if they choose to.

One of the gorilla donkeys, Red Donkey, is shown to be perplexed and regretful at the sight of fellow apes being slaughtered, but it turns out that a counter-ambush had been planned by Caesar's tribe, and their counterattack exterminates the battalion except for four prisoners, including Preacher the marksman, and Red Donkey. Caesar arrives to pass judgement on the prisoners, is told about the reputation of the Colonel, and releases the men to take back a message requesting a cessation of hostilities. Red Donkey, meanwhile, being kept with the apes, attacks his guard, an albino gorilla called Winter, and escapes. The ape warriors then return to their base, in a group of caves by a waterfall, further up the mountain.

Caesar's son, Bright Eyes, returns with Rocket from a scouting mission to discover a safer home for the tribe, and is reunited with his parents, a new infant brother, Cornelius, and Lake, his fiancée. During a discussion about when to move the tribe, Winter becomes very agitated, and Caesar can see that he is scared, as many others might be, of further human attacks, the very reason why there have already been some traitorous defectors. Bright Eyes reassures him that all of them are scared, and the meeting is concluded with the rallying call led by Caesar, 'Apes, together, strong'.

That night, Caesar finds that human soldiers have discovered the tribe's home and are approaching with the aim of killing Caesar. The Colonel himself kills Caesar's wife, Cornelia, and Bright Eyes, then comes face to face with Caesar, retreating before he can complete his mission, leaving Caesar enraged and revengeful. It also becomes apparent that Winter had betrayed the tribe's whereabouts to the humans, and then escaped. Leaving Cornelius in Lake's care, Caesar embarks on a mission to find The Colonel, along with Rocket, Maurice and Luca, the chief gorilla guard, while the rest of the tribe embarks on its own journey to the new, safe zone.

Passing through an apparently deserted human village, Caesar's party is confronted by a man who pulls a gun on them, whereupon they kill him, thereafter discovering a young girl in one of the houses. Maurice befriends her by handing her her doll, discovering that she is mute, and insists on saving her. The party next discover a human military camp, which has on display at its perimeter a banner reading 'THE ONLY GOOD KONG IS A DEAD KONG'. They find Winter there, working as a slave, and ask him about the Colonel. He tells them The Colonel has gone north with a battalion, to meet another large group of soldiers on their way from the north, possibly as reinforcements against the apes. Winter confesses his betrayal before they inadvertently suffocate him in trying to keep him quiet for fear of their presence being discovered. That night, Caesar wakes from a nightmare in which Koba, the deceased, belligerent instigator of the initial hostilities with the San Francisco humans, is reprimanding him for killing a fellow ape.

The party follow the battalion who will lead them to the Colonel. In the snowy mountains, they witness the battalion shooting dead three of their own soldiers, and then discover that they were killed because they had become mute, now understood as a symptom of the virus deadly to humans. After killing him as an act of mercy, they find they have lost the battalion and, while they are discussing which way to proceed, one of their horses is taken by a local, hooded, vagabond, whom they pursue and discover to be a chimpanzee living nearby. This ape does not understand their sign language but can speak; having spent his life among humans, he also wears clothes, and calls himself Bad Ape. Explaining what happened, he says, 'Human get sick. Ape get smart. Then human kill ape'. He then tells them about the 'human zoo', a prison for sick humans, and they realise that this is the military base, which he can lead them to. He protests, claiming that this would be very dangerous, and tries to change the subject by presenting the girl with a gift, a car's name tag reading 'Nova'. Learning of Caesar's plight, however, Bad Ape agrees to lead the party to the military base. As they set out the next morning, Caesar witnesses Luca also developing a fondness for the girl, softening himself up for a first acknowledgement of her presence later in the day, when he offers her water.

Luca is killed in an ambush where the party has stopped to survey the military base, an ex-FEMA quarantine facility at the Oregon-California border, and Nova weeps as she expresses her farewell, returning the flower he had given her that morning. Despite Maurice's advice to turn back, this death only confirms Caesar in his resolve to have his revenge, and is told by Maurice that he now sounds like Koba, whereupon Caesar tells them that he will finish the mission alone. Approaching the edge of the base, he passes a number of 'crucified' apes, and recognises them as members of his own tribe, hung on large, upright logs, almost as a warning to outsiders (an original movie reference), and finally gazes down on the base, realising that his entire tribe has been captured and imprisoned there. This is confirmed by one of the crucified apes, who confirms that The Colonel wanted to use them as labour before killing them. Just then, Caesar himself is knocked unconscious and wakes to find himself being guarded at gunpoint by Preacher, to the sound of a monologue coming from The Colonel, who apologises for killing Caesar's wife and son, then puts him into the pen where nobody

except Lake can look him in the eye; he had been their one hope. Cornelius cries out to him from the separate, children's pen.

The apes wake at dawn to the sound of marching soldiers lining up for their morning assembly led by a captain leading them in a ritualistic chant followed by a general howling, as The Colonel emerges onto the balcony above to survey the battalion. As the U.S.A. national anthem is then played over the loudspeakers, the soldiers rush to violently and loudly herd the prisoner apes to the work location. Caesar realises that the crude wall they are being forced to build, as they are being worked to death without food or water, is part of a defence strategy; that the base is preparing to defend itself against the approaching army. As he witnesses the punishment of an aged orangutan following an accident at the workplace, he incites a widespread demonstration of resistance and is brought to The Colonel. The Colonel shoots dead the aged orangutan as a show of will, then orders Caesar at gunpoint to order everyone to resume work. Caesar refuses, bracing himself for death, but is saved by Lake who leads the others in showing their agreement to work. Caesar is then tied to a cross and left there as an example to the others. This is all being observed through binoculars by Caesar's party, Maurice, Rocket, Nova and Bad Ape, and Maurice makes a plan to save everyone.

Caesar is brought to see the Colonel and they haggle over giving the apes sustenance. Caesar reveals that he knows that the base is going to be attacked by other soldiers. The Colonel explains that the attacking army fear him, then that the virus had mutated and no longer killed the victims; it merely made them mute, though it remained as infectious as ever. He claimed that it was a danger to the survival of humanity because it made them less human, and that anyone contracting the virus needed to be killed, then confessing that he killed his own infected son himself, and also beheaded those who resisted this course of action, a reason for the coming showdown with the forces of the High Command. The Colonel here shows his irrationality in stating, 'This is a holy war. All of human history has led to this moment', then returns Caesar to his cross, and in the morning Caesar sees his tribe being fed.

The apes outside discover an underground tunnel system, finding that it leads into the compound where the tribe are kept overnight. Discovering another exit, Nova and Bad Ape get close enough to see Caesar suffering on the cross. As night falls, Caesar hallucinates, thinking he is seeing the dead Koba approaching him, tempting him to give up, but this turns out to be Red Donkey, who is under orders from The Colonel to cut him down. The Colonel then says if Caesar is still alive in the morning, without food or water, he will have to go to work or be killed. Thereafter, inexplicably, Nova follows an intuition and somehow wanders into the base unnoticed. Finding Caesar in his cage, she gives him her doll for comfort, as well as some food and drink, thus saving his life. Caesar is further heartened by seeing the sign of solidarity unanimously communicated to him by his tribe, then by Nova. They are interrupted by some approaching soldiers, so Rocket risks his life to allow Nova to escape, by creating a diversion, wandering into the base and drawing attention to himself by starting a fight with Red Donkey.

In the morning, Caesar is sent to the quarry and The Colonel picks up the doll he finds lying on the floor of Caesar's cage. Through the day, the apes use sign language to communicate to Caesar, and he to Maurice, to implement the escape plan using the tunnels. Locking up Caesar for the night, Red Donkey tells him that The Colonel will kill all the apes after the battle with the approaching army, and Caesar replies that this would include Red Donkey, along with another comment to inspire a later betrayal of The Colonel.

Water then starts leaking into the tunnel and reaches Maurice, Nova and Bad Ape just as they have made contact with the apes in the compound, starting to fill the tunnel and making the situation more urgent, as well as complicating the matter of rescuing the children from a nearby compound. Meanwhile, Caesar insists that the escape needs to happen immediately because they are all in danger because of the approaching army, and decides the children will have to clamber up poles and along cables in order to escape. The plan is enacted by first pelting one of the guards with

feces. Enraged, he enters the compound, and is overpowered, allowing Caesar to escape using his keys to unlock the gate and access the children's section. The children drop to the ground immediately outside the base and use the tunnel entrance there to get further away, while the adults use the tunnel leading from within their own compound.

Caesar's hate for The Colonel compels him to remain behind to take his revenge. At the moment he decides this, the battle with the newly-arrived army begins, with rockets fired back and forth, and fire erupting inside the base. Inside The Colonel's rooms, Caesar finds him to have contracted the virus due to his contact with Nova's doll, meaning that with one action she had saved Caesar's life, and likely, therefore, that of the tribe, as well as killing the Colonel. Caesar is thus faced with being unable to take revenge on The Colonel because The Colonel is asking to be killed. Realising the inevitable: the end of human civilisation and the subsequent rule of the planet by apes, The Colonel shoots himself.

At the gun post on the perimeter wall, the gunner being assisted by Red Donkey notices the apes emerging from the tunnel outside the wall, and starts to shoot at them, killing many, although some cover is provided by rocks. Caesar sees this, as well as a tanker leaking gasoline, grabs a string of grenades from the table, and leaps out of the window as some soldiers burst in, and, grabbing onto the burning U.S.A. flag on the way down, drops to the ground alongside it. We witness Red Donkey again mesmerised by the sight of apes being slaughtered by humans, just before he sees Caesar racing through the base amidst explosions. Awed and inspired, he watches as Caesar makes to throw a grenade at the leaking tanker, and witnesses Caesar shot by an arrow from Preacher's crossbow, and fall to the ground before he can throw it. Preacher is about to release another, fatal arrow, but is killed by a missile shot at him by Red Donkey before he can do so. Caesar turns to Red Donkey and realises this, but also witnesses Red Donkey being shot dead by the gunner. Then under fire himself, Caesar manages to throw the grenade, detonating the gasoline tanker and setting off another. The explosions spell the end of the battalion's resistance to the army's approach.

Congregating on the hillside, the ape tribe watches as the army moves in, and Caesar watches from behind the nearby rocks. As the army cheers, relishing its easy success, the final word is had by the mountainside, where an avalanche has been triggered by the explosions. As Caesar, the first to notice this, is standing, watching the mountain, some soldiers at the rear of the army notice him and make as if to kill him, but are interrupted by the start of the avalanche. Caesar and the army all start to run, while the tribe take to the treetops, and Caesar heads up the hill, also making for the trees. The army is completely wiped out, while the tribe all survive, to resume their journey to the safe haven. They arrive at sunset, when Caesar is finally able to rest, though he dies within minutes, of his arrow wound, his final sight being of his tribe having found safety.

## Narrative 1: Jewish mythology

From the outset, we are following 'the tribe', with Caesar's apes in the role of the victimised innocents in search of a safe haven, away from those nasty 'WE' goyim. With Hollywood being a Zionist enterprise from its inception, an intentionally weaponised propaganda machine from that moment, it has produced a number of Hollywood depictions of mainstream Jewish history and the Jewish place in society. This might all be a fine thing in a different kind of world, but in this particular age, we have long been cowed and manipulated by deception, lies and secrecy in the name of primitive struggles between factions whose aims include the imperative and usual nefarious ends. In our own recorded history, this appears to have been politicised ever since Josephus Flavius's contribution to the invention of Christianity, then the later establishment of satanic international banking, and the control of 'WE' global and local regimes. The falsification or mythologising of history is an important component of this ongoing project, and for this purpose, others must be demonised and their actions and existence used for distraction from the true crimes, while those purportedly of one's own faction

- those born into religious Judaism - are used as a cover to represent the totality of one's invisible identity, to accuse and apportion blame, and as an excuse for committing every heinous crime imaginable, in the name of this sordid, soulless and satanic business of piecemeal, planetary theft. Indeed, perceived history serves as one of the keys to identifying this Narrative, and is signposted, for our convenience, at the midway point, when Caesar notices the single word 'HISTORY' scrawled three times on the wall in The Colonel's room.

Part of the Jewish mythology propagated in our own times serves the purpose of the twentieth century project to steal Palestine from its people and give it to outsiders, for reasons which include the buttressing of false or perverted histories, as well as a range of geopolitical ambitions. This was achieved, of course, by the Zionist victimisation of many religious Jewish people in Europe as part of planned outcomes of the engineered second world war. Jewishness, as such an effective cover for Zionism, which in some ways victimises Jews almost more than everyone else, needs always to promote Jewish validity in order to perpetuate this cover, so the establishment of Israel had been a long-desired ambition. Of course, it goes without saying that this state is an evil imposition on the world, and has no place here, simply by being a contemporary instance of theft of another people's land, necessitating the genocide of those people, and repopulated by those who have no ethnic ties to the area. This sounds familiar, being the *modus operandi* being repeated globally in 'WE' countries. While the planet will always remain everyone's home, and we will always have the right, even when it is denied, to live wherever we choose on the planet, this is immoral in the extreme when it involves displacing and stealing from others who already live in a place; this is a primitive pattern of behaviour, and will never be right, and cannot be made right, regardless of how much propaganda is thrown at it, or for how long and completely we are lied to about it. The supporting mythology in this case is Biblical, rooted in the bogus tale of the Exodus from Egypt and the wandering in the desert to find 'the promised land'. In this movie, Caesar is our Moses character, ensuring that his tribe reaches the promised land discovered by Rocket and Bright Eyes. Along the way, there is the fraught detour, much as there was in the original tale - forty years, no less, 'wandering in the desert', an additional insult to your intelligence when the distance is a few weeks' walk at the most, even if you start the journey in Luxor (Thebes) - in this case, to dwell on that other, additional mythology concerning the concentration camps of Nazi Germany.

The tribe's wandering in the desert, then, is clearly the main arc of the story, as Caesar's apes make the journey to that land of milk and honey, and they are shown to be in the midst of this journey in the final scenes, walking in a long line, clearly a portrayal of the mythical, dispossessed Hebrews, at one point passing through a desertscape suggestive of that of the Sinai. Thereafter, upon finally reaching the promised land, the book of 'Deuteronomy', verse 34 is invoked as Caesar gives up his spirit in the manner of the Patriarch Moses when the Hebrews finally completed their own 'forty years' of wandering, although the Old Testament only approximately relates the two events of the arrival and Moses's death: 'The Lord said to him, "This is the land I promised ... when I said, "I will give it to your descendants." I have let you see it with your eyes, but you will not cross over into it [...] Moses the servant of the Lord died there'. At this moment, we are presented with a scene of biblical dimensions as the music dictates the significance and gravitas of the event and the sun sets, while a note is added to signify the legacy of the tribe's settlement for posterity, as Caesar tells Maurice, 'You are all home now', and Maurice replies, 'Son will know who was father, and what Caesar did for us'. Incidentally, the images and the storyline arc of the wandering apes also feed into the Agenda's refugee Narrative, simultaneously reinforcing two false and weaponised Narratives enjoying tacit, mutual support.

The hiatus of the camp experience, equated in a more focussed way with the wandering in the desert, perhaps the post-Ten-Commandments years, is something of a pogrom attempted by The Colonel, and a reference to those which took place in European history, and is, more obviously, a 'Holocaust' reference. Our signposts are the victimisation of a particular group, unambiguous enclosures of barbed wire, watchtowers and forced labour, along with a starvation diet, a staff of 'WE' military men, and a disregard for the lives and rights of the inmates. This is evident in the killing and attempted killing of apes without good reason, when Caesar is to be fired upon by the 'liberating'

army, when he is shot with the fatal arrow by Preacher, and when he is shot at by the gunner on the wall during the battle. Furthermore, the escaping apes are targeted by the gunner for no good reason, with the apes posing no apparent threat, women and children among them, and with the enemy at the gate. Incidentally, this is not something which those dastardly Germans did at the point of camp-liberation in 1944, though this is arguably being suggested. In fact, as with the 'liberating' army in the movie, the Allied mission had no humanitarian agenda, being unaware of the incarceration, and the camps only being 'liberated' by default. Incidentally, the fact that Preacher, while having had his life spared by Caesar at the start of the story, fires the fatal shot which soon leads to Caesar's death, marks him as a Judas character, the character who betrayed the Christ, leading to the latter's death in that story, an additional note provided by Josephus, himself the ultimate Judas, in order to add to justifiable resentment on the part of generations of Christians, allowing for the power-brokers to play both sides against each other for the next two millennia. His name, furthermore, allows for another small token of demonisation of Christianity, since 'preacher' is a term almost exclusively applied to Christian evangelists, and we are not encouraged to sympathise at all with Preacher. Indeed, we are almost led to believe that Caesar's sparing his life means that Preacher will be reciprocating this favour later in the storyline, making his killing of Caesar, all the more devastating, though unsurprising since he is a 'WE' man.

The point about this being an end to the tribe, since The Colonel intends for them to needlessly die in the base, apparently a decision based on vindictive, irrational envy, is reinforced, making this a true 'death camp' for them, introduced with Caesar's poignant discovery of the camp and realisation of what has happened. The tunnels also allow for the referencing of camp-escape movies set in World War Two, along with a more recent Hollywood reference to the widely-viewed 'Schindler's List', whereby The Colonel's accommodation overlooking the base is a copy of that of Amon Göth in the camp at Krakow-Plaszów in that movie, while the loudspeaker system used at the camp is also supposed to literally echo the same in other Hollywood camp depictions. It is also very convenient, with regard to well-established camp imagery, very specifically Auschwitz, and the role the railway lines played in transporting detainees to the camps, also definitively portrayed in 'Schindler's List', that there is a train line running into the base, which the apes are shown to cross in their escape. The base itself, The Colonel tells us, 'used to be a weapons depot', and 'They turned it into a relocation camp', words replete with World War Two overtones. The approaching army obviously plays the role of the liberating Allied forces in Germany, their arrival in the movie coinciding with the tribe's escape, in accordance with the mythologised events of 1944, painting the 'Allies' as the oh-so good guys, despite the fact that all starvation and malnutrition-related deaths in the camps resulted from the German supply lines having been bombed into oblivion by the trigger-happy FWO, as they embarked on a year-long spree of massively augmented slaughter and destruction, the one true 'holocaust' of the war, likely their most inhumane and extensive war-crime ever.

Interestingly, the appellation Caesar, besides being the name of the main ape character from the fourth movie (1971), was applied to the Flavian emperors, of course, so we are in Palestinian territory from the outset, with this nod to the Jewish conspiracy to usurp global Roman domination, in perpetuity, through that dynasty. In Josephus's text, 'The Wars of the Jews', written in parallel to the so-called New Testament to cynically declare the mendacious nature of the latter, the activities of the Caesar Titus Flavius are paralleled allegorically with those of the Christ character in the New Testament, which brings us directly to the scenes in this movie where, following a general refusal of his tribe to acknowledge him when he is first interned in the camp, Caesar sacrifices his safety for their sakes, and is even strung up in the guise of being crucified, directly alluding to these religions in a contrived and striking way. It should be also borne in mind that the Jesus character is a paste of the Moses patriarch, to whom we have already established a Caesarean connection.

Since the secret of Josephus's deception is paralleled in most of the 'Shakespeare' plays, their chief purpose, this would mark this movie as a literary work of art, as a presumptuous homage to this achievement in the 'Shakespeare' work. Besides this, the 'War' of the title might also be understood as an allusion to the 'Wars of the Jews' and the history it depicts, such that the word 'Jews' in that title is supplanted by the phrase 'Planet of the Apes' in this one; the storyline basically being a

description of the events, historical to the tune of exactly 2000 years when viewed from the perspective of the original movie, which led to the domination of the planet by apes, just as the Wars of the Jews, as well as the parallel text of the new Testament, describes the events leading to the domination of the planet by zionism under the cover of Christianity. Thus, the apes are the Jews, the infamous 'underdog' tribe rising to dominate and usurp their former oppressors. Our Caesar, therefore, as a fictitious servant of the Luciferian cause, is lauded with the honours of simultaneously representing the emperor, the prophet Moses and the Christ, a triumph of trinitarian literature. We might also consider and appreciate the serendipity of the 'Shakespearean'-like pun of the term 'cruci-fiction', since we are speaking of the crossing over of different works of fiction (fixion).

Another minor reference to World War Two includes the subtle appearance of a novel, 'A Far Country' (1915), on The Colonel's table. This is not only written by a namesake of the warmonger, Winston Churchill, but is also titled using a phrase found in the New Testament parable of the Prodigal Son, the novel's own storyline loosely based on this, with the main human character, The Colonel, experiencing a change to his fundamental values. This calls us again to the biblical undercurrent, and potentially casts The Colonel in the role of that son returned, part of his apparently maniacal belief, since the killing of his own son, in a further Abrahamic twist, that anything he does is forgivable, presumably by himself, or Father History himself. The book's title also easily references the Exodus mythology with which the storyline is chiefly concerned. It is also noteworthy that the Alpha-Omega reference, scrawled in many places, and even shouted, in the form of 'We are the beginning and the end' as part of the battalion's dawn assembly, also signifies that the conflation of the two bogus histories of the bible and World War Two is intentional.

## Narrative 2: race

The Apes movies have, since the beginning, been a tacit commentary on apartheid societies, most significantly showcasing an engineered state of poor race relations in the U.S.A., whether this was or is actual, exaggerated or false, between 'WE' and 'NWE' U.S.A. citizens, rooted, of course, in the exaggerated and selective history regarding the slave trade. This 'black-white' relationship was initially inverted in the first two movies, with 'WE' people, in this case representing 'NWE' people, being treated abominably by a society of apes, by way of dropping the theme into societal consciousness in a somewhat palatable format. We are back on familiar Hollywood ground, however, by the third and fourth movies (1971, 1972), where apes are given the subservient role in the present day and near-future U.S.A., intending to represent the historically bad treatment of 'NWE' people, not least because in that fourth movie, they are being used as slaves. The representation of 'NWE' people as apes was inferred rather than implied, but may have augmented the popularity of those movies at the time, in the context of the decades-old, civil rights struggle, shown to heat up even more, with the ape uprising and overthrow of human civilisation in that fourth movie. Indeed, Martin Luther King Junior was murdered in the same year that the original movie was released, and the portrayal of a species-divided society inevitably struck a chord with the zeitgeist. However, what may have been part of a loose reference, with the intention, perhaps, to stir, or toy with, racial resentment, in that more experimental era of Hollywood propaganda, was, by the start of the new century, being consciously harnessed by a mature and focussed Hollywood political machine in which, as stated, every decision about every part of the content of every movie is much more carefully designed to promote intersecting aspects of the nefarious agenda of the FWO, rather than a single theme. Race-consciousness, therefore, being part of the weaponry deployed in all 'WE' societies, was always going to be a big player in the resurgent apes movie franchise, not, as before, as a crude tool for pushing resentment clumsily about, but as part of an array of Agenda points, each point and each movie serving the greater evil of the whole, adding piecemeal to the weight of numbers, the Narratives, according to Ape movie tradition, being masked and subliminal.

Our recent history of race relations also touches upon global strife, since we have been through the National-Socialist Germany experience, serving to legitimise, in the limestream media's dog-whistling of the 'useful idiots' in 'WE' societies, the demonisation of nationalist sentiment in any form. War, therefore, also has its role among the ingredients of this Narrative, and we are thus presented with an extremist and evidently sociopathic dictator, in the form of The Colonel, leading his majority-'WE', majority-male battalion. The Colonel is rabidly 'racist', since he is rabidly anti-ape, having inflated the issue of the simian virus, in his own mind, to ideological proportions. His reasoning makes clear his belief that humans are superior to apes, and that he is working on a military footing to protect the interests of his own kind. 'If we lose', he says, 'we will be the last of our kind. it will be a planet of apes. and we will become your cattle'. Although The Colonel is easily read as a Brando character (Colonel Kurtz in 'Apocalypse Now' (1979)), this is also, arguably, a Mussolini one. The shaven-headedness of The Colonel and his soldiers - the very few females glimpsed have their hair tightly tied to approximate the look - is a semiological marker for 'WE' neo-fascist, as seen in many movie portrayals, serving to make these men appear less humane, more brutally inclined, and cold-blooded, militaristic types. Our attention is drawn to the Mussolini reference when The Colonel is shown shaving his head, which also echoes the shave taken by Amon Goth on his balcony taken at the Kraków-Płaszów labour camp in 'Schindler's List', and very deliberately so, since the placement of The Colonel's apartment overlooking the base is, as mentioned, an intertextual reference to that movie.

The element of plausible deniability evidenced by the very fleeting presence of a female face or two, serving to promote a so-called equality between the genders in the military, and a flimsy pretence that it is not only males who are constantly demonised, is paralleled by the presence of 'NWE' battalion personnel, although more significant is the fact that the battalion leader is 'NWE', an element, The Colonel's status notwithstanding, of 'NWE' 'supremacy'; while we would wish the selection of such details to be as random and unconscious as is pretended, such ideals have long since been completely betrayed. The issue of skin colour is also highlighted in the regular betrayals of trust by 'WE' characters, and it goes without saying that The Colonel's 'WE' status, as well as what appears to be almost all of his personnel, is significant; these are the standard, deranged, race-conscious oppressors of many movies, after all. But it is in the appearance of individuals that this part of the Narrative is more fully exploited. There is the betrayal of 'WE' Preacher, as discussed, and of the 'WE' man in the village where Maurice finds Nova. He says to Caesar's group that he is just going to put down his logs, but then, unprovoked, reaches for a gun to attack them; as a 'WE' man, therefore, his word cannot be trusted. There is also the case of Winter, the albino gorilla, who betrayed Caesar and the tribe for selfish reasons and out of fear or cowardice, leading to the death of Caesar's wife and son. His own death, although accidental, remains a rare instance of an ape killing another ape, evidently expedient, given his 'skin' colour, and even deserved, considering his betrayal. Such an analysis might also stretch to the white horse, used by Bad Ape to escape from Caesar's party after trying to steal from their saddle bags, in this instance associating the horse with the criminal being pursued, but also when we are shown the image of the party's four horses, on more than one occasion, in profile, walking in single file, and can easily note that this one white horse is placed at the rear of the line. Not only this, it is Luca's horse, and he is the only one of the party who ends up dying.

Since racism only exists insofar as racist behaviour is exhibited, the demonisation and denigration of the victims is always an element, usually expressed in emotive language and name-calling, which often serves as a psychological justification for physical violence against those victims. Such behaviour is clearly evident today among leftists who, having nothing of any substance to charge their 'opponents' with, use infantile name-calling to bolster their zealous fantasies about their victims' imagined transgressions, which often leads to unprovoked physical attacks on those victims, all of which is encouraged and cheered by the institutionalised propaganda outlets, violence towards everybody being the eventual default behaviour of leftism. This movie opens with such linguistic denigration and 'othering' scattered among the battalion's soldiers as they close in for an attack on Caesar's tribe. On their helmets are scrawled slogans such as 'MONKEY KILLER', 'BEDTIME FOR BONZO' (a 1951 Hollywood comedy featuring a chimpanzee), 'ENDANGERED SPECIES', and 'A'



and 'Ω'. The latter is a reference to the movie 'Beneath the Planet of the Apes' (1970), in which an attack on a New York City-based human colony by the local ape tribe ended in the destruction of the Earth by atomic bomb. This bomb was worshipped by the humans as their insurance against such attack, which was a cold-war, M.A.D. reference, and on which was inscribed these letters, signifying this religiosity - a 'WE' weakness, apparently - and the idea that the end of life on Earth is a divine inevitability, thus setting the tone for this movie, a microcosm of the apparent end of human civilisation.

The 'donkeys' have even been branded with 'AΩ' on their foreheads, which, of course, is a reference to slavery, as slaves in the North American colonies, like cattle, were usually branded with hot irons to identify them with their owners. There is also the use of 'Kong', referring to King Kong, the movie gorilla, used in the field as shorthand, as in, 'We've got eyes on three Kong in the north woods', though it also serves as a cross-reference to the Vietnam war (as does The Colonel's Brandon-like character from 'Apocalypse Now'), with the enemy 'Cong' (Viet Cong) pronounced identically. Finally, The Colonel refers to Caesar's tribe as a 'herd', to equate them with mindless cattle, although a group of chimpanzees or gorillas would be correctly referred to as a troop. In case we are in any doubt about the racist overtones in these lexis, The Colonel exclaims to Caesar at one point, 'Look at your eyes! Almost human', intended to echo similar sentiments of thought and deed attributable to 'WE' characters, in the Hollywood version of history, regarding 'NWE' people and the 'WE' belief in the less-than-human nature of 'NWE' people. A self-aggrandising, 'supremacist' tone is also evident in his justification for fighting against the spread of the virus, as he claims that it would be 'robbing us of those things that make us human: our speech; our higher thinking', and he adds, as if referring to apes, 'It would turn us into beasts'. The struggle to be understood as civilised, in order to pacify The Colonel, when releasing the captured human soldiers in an early scene, is apparent in Caesar's comment to Maurice, that 'He will see we are not savages'. This tells us that Caesar is aware of what humans think of apes, although 'savage' is a label used to refer to humans rather than apes, which is another clue to the allegorical nature of the storyline. Incidentally, we are also to understand in this act of Caesar's that it is 'NWE' people who are interested in making and preserving peace, while the 'WE' people are the aggressors. While there may be some authentic historical veracity to this assertion, it would also obviously be as much of a mistake to conflate the behaviour of 'WE' people with that of the regimes which enslave and exploit them, as to conflate Jewish people with their own zionist handlers.

The moronic parroting of insulting epithets, as part of the battalion's ideology, also extends to their military life. This is intended to show them, as prominently 'WE', adhering blindly to their cause and easily rallied by slogans, in the imagined manner of the populations of Nazi Germany, or of nationalist political parties of more recent times, rather than by any reason or logic. They start their mornings at the base, for instance, with a brief, shouted, prompt-response ritual containing both threatening and 'supremacist' overtones which, for as long as this Narrative serves their purposes, is the way in which the propagandist gurus would like the sheeple to perceive those who have different opinions to their own:

'Blood! - Makes the grass grow!'

'We! - Make the blood flow!'

'We are the beginning! - And the end!'

Meanwhile, scattered about the base are other painted slogans evidently intended, ironically, to propagandise the soldiers, as if they had no minds of their own, rather like those prevalent, equally ironically, in communist nations of the recent past, or even of the notorious 'arbeit macht frei' posted at the entrance to the German concentration camps:

'BE ASHAMED TO DIE UNTIL YOU HAVE WON SOME VICTORY FOR HUMANITY'

'KEEP FEAR TO YOURSELF SHARE COURAGE WITH OTHERS'

'TO LIVE IS TO SUFFER'

This level of mindlessness is associated with other targets of the Narrative, since the morning chant is juxtaposed with a brief sample of 'The Star Spangled Banner' (the U.S.A. national anthem) with a U.S.A. national flag hanging vertically above the soldiers, this scrawled with a large 'AQ' sign, in order to further denigrate the flag and what it historically represents, the intention being that we link the reprehensibly bigoted attitude and ideology of the battalion and its leader with all past and present day patriots. The other target is religion, its tendency to bind and perpetuate settled communities and cultures, although only that of Christianity, being that which historically belongs to 'WE' cultures, is ever lambasted. This is evident when The Colonel condescends to emerge onto his balcony to overlook the dutiful battalion as he disdainfully shaves his head and 'blesses' them with a cross he signs in the air with his cut-throat razor. As the demon of the storyline, Caesar's bigoted nemesis, he also wears a crucifix around his neck, and has a crucifix on the wall in his apartment. This is all in order to demonise 'WE' history and culture, which is shown to die, in effect, with The Colonel himself.

Interestingly, at the same time that propagandised and otherwise Hollywood-historical references are necessarily deployed in all these Narratives, a concern with history is simultaneously, selectively demonised in the storyline. Of course, any knowledge or understanding of history has always been a target of regimes throughout the world and through recorded history. In more recent times, for instance, countries run by communist regimes within living memory attempted an erasing of all history; we are told that the inmates of those countries had no access to any versions of history at all. Under those regimes closer to the FWO, on the other hand, it is the control of history which has been the preferred modus operandi, tightly controlled and propagandised. The issue they have to manage is that denying access to historical knowledge would raise suspicions among peoples who live under the general delusion that they enjoy authentic liberty and access to influence. Therefore, quite simply, certain versions of history are approved and publicised, while others are repressed in a variety of ways, and a multitude of historical events are permitted to enter the canon while another multitude are altered or removed, the problem being, of course, that logic would otherwise lead to the uncovering of the countless crimes and lies of the FWO throughout history, including all the lies about history itself. Here, we should also bear in mind the 'memory hole', and the sentence, 'Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past', in Orwell's '1984' (1948); the manipulation and tight control over perceived history is extremely important to the FWO in the management of the human population they keep as slave labour in the real world. Any revisionism, and revisionists, it is to be assumed, besides even a general interest in history, are fair game for demonisation.

The Colonel's concern with history implies that of 'WE' people, and this part of history is therefore evidently targeted in the portrayal of The Colonel as unhinged and even obsessed with the past, highlighted in the sight of the sole word 'HISTORY' scrawled three times on the wall of his apartment, and when he is speaking the names of historical, male and militaristic individuals, as Caesar first regains consciousness in The Colonel's apartment after his capture: 'Grant and Lee, Wellington and Napoleon, Custer and Sitting Bull', with the last one included as a masking. This is largely an attack on the early history of the U.S.A., while The Colonel's concern with the way things are going, in statements such as 'If we lose, we will be the last of our kind. It will be a planet of apes. and we will become your cattle', is supposed to represent the concerns of not only those ('Democrats') who fought to maintain the status quo of the slave economy during Lincoln's time, but also their 'WE' descendants in the U.S.A., as if present-day 'WE' U.S.A. people might harbour a similar resentment and paranoia about being displaced by 'NWE' people. While appearing to play a minor part in this movie, it is at the heart of the Agenda, since the destruction of the 'WE' cultures and peoples relies on significant numbers of them being hoodwinked into a twilight zone of bogus remorse for assumed past wrongs in order to help facilitate the destruction of their cultures in the present.

Another common theme, the slavery angle, is explicitly referenced in the forced labour of the imprisoned tribe, and somewhat foreshadowed by the use of the 'donkeys' in the opening battle scene, and in the scene of Winter's predicament as a kitchen slave following his defection. This neatly maps onto the death-camp Narrative since those camps were, for the most part, labour

camps; it seems that the FWO can have it both ways with 'history'. This is clarified for us at the moment of Caesar's realisation of the catastrophe when the ape he finds dying of his inflicted wounds on the hill outside the base, tells him that The Colonel had said, 'they would use us before we died', and 'They've been forcing us to work'. There is also some significance in the purpose of this work, since Caesar asks him, 'What kind of work?', with the horror of the situation, as well as the mystery of what this work might be, to pique our interest, exaggerated by his not receiving an answer, so that we are then left to anticipate and focus on this answer when it arrives. The harsh treatment of apes by humans, which we are led to believe is something like an endemic trait, is intimated when Caesar tells Maurice that Koba, long dead, 'could not forgive what humans did to him', and this is more specifically framed in a slavery context, when we see that whipping is used as a punishment. Also, just in case we dilute our slavery-Hollywood history with our Roman-Hollywood history, in ordering Caesar's punishment, The Colonel tells Red Donkey to 'string him up', referring to the odd, 'crucifixion' tying of apes to the diagonal crosses, but intended to invoke the idea of casual murdering of slaves by extra-judicial hanging, in the U.S.A., something we are encouraged to believe was commonplace until well into the twentieth century.

Caesar, the patriarch, representing the enslaved minority, and the self-appointed and imagined social groups of the real world, including all 'NWE' people, is, by the end of the storyline, finally elevated to the status of absolute and righteous saviour, warrior and hero, being ultimately responsible for the complete destruction not only of The Colonel's nasty battalion, but also of the entire invading army. In the event, that 'liberating' army, representing 'WE' people, is proven impotent, their thousands of heavily armed soldiers being upstaged by the actions of a single, unarmed ape, as Caesar, with his use of the hand grenades to ignite the gasoline, inadvertently sets off the avalanche which buries them all. In the storyline, this represents the obliteration of all human civilisation, while in terms of the Narrative, it means the destruction of 'WE' peoples and cultures in particular. This is a ritualised enactment of a long-held genocidal ambition on the part of the FWO, intended to have a magical influence on the realisation of that ambition in the real world.

There are now no human survivors except Nova, the 'new' human, the one exception to the obliteration of humanity, enjoying our sympathy, despite being 'WE', for being innocent, non-male, siding with the deserving and persecuted apes, and suffering from the inability to speak. Incidentally, it can be observed and noted that white people, predominantly men, in movies are often depicted as mindless, idiotic, ignorant, and innocent, which is played out alongside the depictions of them as psychopathic, self-serving and violent, with the resulting impression being that the explanation for these destructive traits lies in their congenital stupidity. Nova's having been adopted by Caesar's tribe is intended to show us how very accommodating and hospitable all 'NWE' cultures and peoples are, especially in comparison to the maliciously destructive and xenophobically hostile 'WE' cultures and people, represented here by the last of the humans, and also in spite of having been the victims of those people from whom she originated. As a Narrative bonus, her integration into the tribe is thus neatly framed as benign multiculturalism, with the 'WE' person in a minority of one, yet serving the purpose of blurring the line between the humans and the apes, to allow us to read them as interchangeable human societies, much as the Caesars of both this movie and the fourth one (1972) arose from within human society. We are also invited to consider Nova's fate: as the sole human ('WE') in the isolated tribe, she will never reproduce, and will live out her days as the last of her line; as such, this truly is a promised land for the FWO, an oblique form of castration which also parallels the muting effect of the virus upon humanity. 'WE' people, as well as humanity in general, have been conveniently silenced, reduced to existing as the 'dumb' creatures they really are, and neither they nor Nova are able to fully express themselves or their fuller natures. As if this were part of a natural continuum, we are treated to the silence of Preacher, who has been given this name apparently ironically, since he speaks so little, and certainly does not espouse any positive message when he does so; on the contrary, being obedient to The Colonel to the last, he is the one who shoots Caesar with the fatal arrow. His obedient silence is one with his betrayal of the apes who spared his life, since he must, being 'WE', and according to the Narrative's aim to invert reality, ally himself unstintingly with his own 'race'.

Meanwhile, Nova's muteness, and that of all humans now, in the real world representing both the entirety of humanity and 'WE' people especially, is another Hollywood-poetic way of ritualistically subjugating them in an act of wishful-prayer. By afflicting them with the removal of their linguistic abilities, which will negatively affect their cognitive abilities, we are witnessing a visualisation of a prized goal of the FWO. In this case, we might read the presence and survival of the apes, being 'non-human', as an expedient juxtaposition to the fate of humanity. The increasing restrictions on our birthrights, the freedoms of thought and speech, in the real world, are easily invoked here, while the pelting of the guard at the base with feces, as part of the escape plan, illustrates what the FWO truly think of humanity. According to long-cherished plans, they would welcome the retraction of our access to all information, and especially to our language and widespread literacy; we are at the pre-planned stage when those liberties which were cautiously and advisedly implemented in order to advance the FWO's nefarious agenda into the technological age, along with the removal of the European religion (Roman scam number 1) and the exploitation of the Middle Eastern religion (Roman scam number 2), against the backdrop of the rise of the internet, now need to be removed and humanity reduced to its former status as a minimal slave force with no such liberties, existing under a technocratic feudalism with a much-reduced ability to think or act in its own interest. As discussed, the FWO knows about the differences between the races of humanity, each with its own predispositions, strengths and weaknesses, and considers the existence of 'WE' peoples as the greatest impediment to the re-subjugation of all of humanity; ever looking only to their own business advantage, they truly consider that all 'NWE' people, generally make more manageable slaves. Nova, then, truly represents what is intended to be the 'new' human and humanity's new situation. Meanwhile, because the path to this goal in the short term necessitates the reduction or removal of 'WE' peoples and cultures, those first in the firing line, the requirement that she be a 'WE' person is also apparent.

The intention to destroy 'WE' peoples and cultures in the real world is quite obvious since it is being played out, rather clumsily and hurriedly, via the aforementioned weaponised immigration being deployed against Europe and North America, in the main, with Australasia and South Africa similarly targeted. In the U.S.A., the debate about this has tended to focus on the existence of the borders, and the need to install an effective barrier against migrants entering the country illegally from the south. Very strangely, the FWO propaganda has actually managed to get a surprising number of mentally deficient U.S.A. citizens to adhere to the belief that there should be no such barriers, or even borders. Of course, such a belief cannot be justified in debate, and is easily understood as the ravings of the insane. Sadly, it is also clear that, as is common among humanity, these beliefs are not the result of any logic or thought, but have been implanted in these people via the propaganda network. Thankfully, the ruse has only worked on a minority of people, although that minority includes most of the minions of the entire lamestream media establishment, and the border issue maintains a significant presence in that propaganda. The argument is usually reduced to sloganeering, whereby one is either for or against building or reinforcing 'the wall', as if it were an issue related to race, and the appearance and demonisation of the existence of walls has also become part of Hollywood propaganda, scattered almost inconspicuously through a number of recent movies. In this instance, the apes are set to work building a wall which will obviously prove completely ineffective once the 'liberating' army arrives, with its airborne and superior firepower, so the decision to have them build a wall is therefore an obviously bogus storyline device. The battalion, building their 'wall' to repel invaders, whom we could read as a benign force, can thus be read as the evil 'WE' peoples attempting to insulate themselves against the wider world, to preserve the privileges, earned through the labour of others, of their race alone. As The Colonel says, 'I need that wall'. Immigration to the U.S.A. has also been historically and truthfully characterised as having and implementing a quarantine policy, both at Ellis Island and at the present day border crossings. In the movie, we are told that the base is 'an ex-FEMA quarantine facility', and although FEMA, while part of the DHS, do not supervise the borders, they are here associated with quarantine processing which, most significantly, was carried out at a northern border point.

## Narrative 3: dystopian future

The dystopian future is pretty much par for the course for science fiction storylines, practically a sub-genre in its own right. The dystopia is a largely unspecified context for the more detailed Narratives, a dark canvas upon which the shadows can be applied, shifting shapes as they declare and enact their purposes in subtle or obvious ways. The portrayal of the dystopian future is part of the most obvious programming of negative expectations, with accompanying lack of ambition and self-respect, narcissism, fatalistic and suicidal tendencies, substance abuse and addictions, extreme lifestyle deviancies, and the sheeplic, fascistic tendency to attack anyone who appears to be trying to point out that none of this is remotely advisable. The dystopian future also often plays host to some specific and related Narratives which contribute to the same negative outcomes or boldly illustrate some very specific desires of the FWO. As we have seen, and as is apparent in this movie, these include human depopulation and the collapse of human civilisation and culture. Indeed, the overarching theme of this three-part movie series looks to be this obliteration, and we join this third part of the story during its final collapse, cheering on the comeuppance of evil humanity, as well as the survival of the well-meaning apes which will replace them; neither the planet nor humanity deserve each other, and natural justice will out. The devaluation of humanity is assisted by the absence, except for Preacher and Nova, of having personal names, which allow us a certain dignity and identity. Preacher is an obvious nickname, and Nova is a name taken from an industrial product and bestowed on her by Bad Ape and Maurice; these are not names given to them by their parents. The absence of names is especially striking in the case of The Colonel, since his is such a prominent role, but his character simply does not have one. Since names are not given to animals unless they are pets, as with Preacher and Nova, this is a way of equating human beings with animals; disposable, and individually insignificant.

One very effective and striking way of portraying this Narrative, of showing that we are, without a doubt, in the future, is by featuring images which are very familiar at the present time but which have lost all meaning, largely due to the collapse or alteration of human society. This renders these images pathetic and poignant as they highlight our current vanities, our infantile, normalcy bias, and the futility of our current hopes and dreams, while also reminding us of a direct link from our present to this complete degeneration and loss, and that our current way of life is under threat; we are to live in fear in the present, because of what is coming our way, so carefully crafted to make it as realistic as possible. Placement of such imagery has played a part in this movie franchise from the start, with the appearance of the sculpture 'Liberty Enlightening the World' in the final moments of the original movie (1968), while the main events of the second movie take place in the subway train tunnels and rooms of New York City's Grand Central Station (1970). In this particular movie, the inevitable images from popular culture include the defaced national flag of the U.S.A., and, more fleeting and subtle, the defunct television in the room where Caesar's party discovers Nova. The broken Chevrolet 'Nova' car logo given to the girl by Bad Ape is another such signifier, as are the ski resort where they discover Bad Ape, and a worn and faded image on an abandoned truck, advertising Coca Cola and sporting the phrase, 'open happiness', echoing back through the years and into the present, provoking a level of self-pity calculated to mock us and encourage us to give up on life. Equally ironically, such products as this brand of beverage, of course, are also part of the war on humanity in the real world, the kind of poison which only contributes to everything the dystopian future narrative entails; Coke, it seems, will have the last, inane word, even into a time when nobody is left to decipher its sorry message.

This engineered mood is enhanced, as with so many contemporary movies, by the visual darkness of the scenes. Even when these do not take place at night or in a dark interior, the sight of a clear or bright sky is off-limits and the photography has been manipulated towards darkness; no note of optimism can be allowed to intrude upon the oppressive atmosphere or your lack of relief, until the last moment, of course, when the tribe arrives in the promised land, and, even though this is the 'sunset' on humanity, setting the tone for that overarching theme of the movie series, it appears to be trying to compensate for the two hours of foregoing darkness, as if attempting to legitimise that

negativity and leave you with the idea, although not the impression, that this was a reasonably balanced storyline, in the way of the brief, 'feelgood' story planted at the tail end of a news programme. This device was equally obvious at the close of the original Blade Runner (1982), while the pervasive darkness, once anathema to movies and their audiences, is now commonplace both visually and thematically; as the audiences' levels of tolerance for depravity have been increased, the floodgates have been opened on a slew of graphic violence. Unfortunately, people's ability to tolerate the negative feelings which naturally accompany the viewing of such depravity has never been this adaptable, so the negative emotions engendered by the moods, storylines and actions in these movies will have its highly desired, damaging effects on individual and societal health.

## Narrative 4: familial estrangement

Of course, no movie can be considered for production unless it kowtows to the familial estrangement agenda. While this has long been a staple of Hollywood propaganda, it appears to have become a cast iron requirement more recently. It can also be expediently intersected with the anti-'WE' part of the agenda, such that it might be the more 'WE' families who have been unable to maintain normal familial relationships. After all, according to what we are told, 'WE' men are generally violent and unprincipled, so we would be surprised, rather than otherwise, if we were presented with a portrayal of a stable, 'WE', male-female marital relationship, as main roles in a movie; we would be so shocked, in fact, that we would inevitably realise this was because such a thing has become an impossibility among Hollywood products. The main purposes of this narrative is to normalise the idea of the unparented or inadequately parented child, and to remove all possibility that children can exist in a close relationship with one or both parents; the relationship is merely peripheral to the child's life. As such, just as father and mother must be separated, so children must also be estranged or removed from one or both parents, much as many of them are in the real world, where 'child protection' services in many 'WE' countries will falsify pretexts with which to enforce such a removal, often then tragically placing the children in real harm's way by lodging them with physically and/or sexually abusive 'foster' families. Both art and life, in this instance, imitate each other in equal measure.

There is a long list of instances of such familial estrangement in this movie. For a start, there is the parallel of the father's loss of a son, in the cases of Caesar, R and The Colonel. In the latter case, The Colonel, besides being the killer of Caesar's son, also states that he killed his own son. 'I pulled the trigger', he says, which may be a faint demonisation of the Second Amendment, 'It purified me'. This horrific tale is, perhaps, a parody of the biblical story of the patriarch Abraham killing the goat in place of his son, or of the Christian god serving up his 'son' to be slaughtered by the heartless Roman empire, except that in this case, 'the Lord' was not with the godless The Colonel, and would appear to be, since he does not express any remorse about this, saying, 'I realised that I would have to sacrifice my only son so that humanity could be saved', an act of proicide, something which, of course, could only be carried out by a 'WE' man. Additionally, we also learn that Bad Ape had lost his child, though we do not know if this was male or female. The camp legends also serve us well in the separation of the children from the parents when they are incarcerated at the base, which is a reference to something the Germans did, according to Hollywood lore, in the wartime labour camps, and which has also been more recently cited, equally falsely, as a parallel crime in the processing of asylum claimants at the U.S.A.'s borders. We also have the case of Caesar's leaving his younger son behind, in his quest for revenge against The Colonel, knowing full well that he might not return. In the event, his death upon reaching the promised land very soon afterwards makes an orphan of Cornelius anyway. There is also Nova, the orphan child, and we are not told whether the man who deceitfully pulled a gun on Caesar's group was her father, which would have made him a single parent. In being left to possibly assume this, we are also invited to digest the fact that she shows no remorse about his death, even though he had apparently been her only companion. Caesar's wife is also killed, while no mention is ever made of anyone else's wife, and it is assumed

that all the family members of every soldier in the battalion have died; orphans abound, and the wartime context easily allows for this.

Since this Narrative is also somewhat leftist, we are often presented with the notion that 'family', or anything which a family might be assumed to give us, is to be found anywhere, among any groups of friends and acquaintances. In many Hollywood instances, individuals are 'communed' with non-family, and great efforts are made to illustrate how very mutually-supportive, meaningful and fulfilling such relationships are. This is another reflection of the nonsensical and often counter-intuitive narrative existing in the real world regarding the holy status of teamwork, as if working in groups were always the very best way to achieve absolutely anything. Meanwhile, in the real world, working with family members, rather than with non-family, is more likely to prove the most dependable arrangement in many ventures, and has always been used in business, as well as by nefarious power players; it is both natural and ubiquitous. In Hollywood, however, family is often substituted by friends and other non-familial groupings, whereupon everyone lives happily ever after. This negation of the family has long been part of Hollywood product, whereby main characters exist in the world as entirely independent entities, with no background and no sense of familial support. We can easily note this in a multitude of movies, however old: unless it is integral to the plot, no mention is made of a character's family. It is as if a character suddenly appears, for example, as a disgruntled young adult, without any familial background, just drifting along until they can attach to some strangers and easily adopt them as 'family', finally contented and fulfilled. In this movie, we have the example of Caesar's tribe, working harmoniously together, with bonds as strong as familial ties between all the tribe's members, and often when we are shown such depictions, there is saccharin music playing. Into this paradise, Nova is dropped, and is easily assimilated, as mentioned. This is all in some contrast to the way The Colonel's battalion operates. We never see those individuals interact, and when shown in a group, they are shouting maniacally and militaristically for their cold-blooded, abstract causes. In this portrayal, it is evident that care has been taken to depict the two groupings in very different ways. Finally, we can ponder Caesar's incredible achievement in achieving the release of his tribe, as well as the destruction of both The Colonel's battalion and the 'liberating' army: none of this was achieved alone, since they and Caesar would all have been doomed but for the intervention and cooperation of Maurice, Rocket, Bad Ape, and honorary tribe member, Nova; although Caesar has to be shown as a lone hero, in order to emphasise the incompetency of the populous battalion in failing to contain or destroy him or his tribe, care has also been taken to showcase the value of teamwork.

## Narrative 5: the religion of evolution

Although not headlined in this movie, the Apes movies have also always one foot in the door of the religion of evolution. This woolly theory was rolled out nearly two centuries ago in order to undermine the spiritual sustenance which 'WE' peoples gained from their religion. That had been a testament to the human spirit and potential in the face of adversity, since they were able to benefit from their religion in this way despite its incessant, industrialised perpetration of a wide range of the worst anti-human atrocities throughout its bloody history. Unfortunately, most people conflate institutionalised, acculturated religion with information regarding the greater questions of life and death, and the meanings and purposes of these; even though such religions have nothing to tell us about those questions, being as worldly as anything you could mention, they have pretended to have those answers in order to entrap, enslave and program, largely serving the most negative forces imaginable. However, since this scenario had ceased to work as well as intended, in a changing world, the Darwinist religion was dreamed up during the 'enlightenment' psyop, in much the same way that those religions originally were, was then foisted upon the people from all angles, and only became more emphatically evangelised as time passed, in order to remove the sense of security and reassurance with which 'WE' people's religion provided them. The main order of business was to remove all notions and consideration of spiritual realms, the higher purpose and divine nature of

humanity, the nature of the universe, the notion of a Prime Mover or singular, creative instigator of life, the oneness of all existence, the truth about our purpose in this life, and what we do before and after our lives. This would allow for increased nihilism, and the acceleration of the depravity agenda, not to mention the concomitant maneuverability of the overall Agenda, as we approached the endgame.

The Darwinist religion has been simplified into bite-sized nuggets for popular consumption, such that most people will claim to believe in it based on its sound theories of 'survival of the fittest' and the inexplicably sudden mutation of biological cells from one generation to the next, of any species. Regardless of the documented facts which disprove all aspects of that religion, the results, hand in hand with all-points propaganda, and the anti-education modus operandi, have worked well for the FWO, contributing greatly to widespread and increasing materialism and negativity. In the end, the blood sacrifice of war has proven just as easy to manufacture and staff as it ever has been, while human compassion, empathy, hope and charity have been locked down as socially aberrant behaviours, apparently forever, except for the fake versions of these, propagated and imitated through media, and applied highly selectively in the service of the Agenda. The other thing which people might claim to understand about the Darwinist religion is that it proves that humans and other species, especially other primates, have common ancestry, while many will misunderstand even this fallacy, misrepresenting it as the more extreme absurdity of 'people come from apes', as if apes of some kind were actual ancestors of ours. This, then, is where the apes come in, with the original movie being a kind of homage to the catch-all elasticity of the Darwinist religion, showing that, a couple of millennia into the future, humans have devolved while apes have evolved.

With the absurdities inherent in this premise of the original movie, one might have thought it would be abandoned and forgotten. On the contrary, the resurgent series of these three movies seeks to fill and account for the gaps in the original storyline, in order to resurrect it and tie us strongly to its message. This is also superficially apparent in the character names taken from the original movies: Nova, Caesar, Bright Eyes, and Cornelius (and Cornelia). The first movie, for instance, in addressing the impossibly short duration of two millennia to account for the extreme changes in the species, covers the rapid evolution of apes and degeneration of humanity, with the developments of a laboratory drug and a virus, respectively. As The Colonel simply says, it 'mutated'. However, this is a practical impossibility outside of microbiology; mutation of large creatures is an invention of Neo-Darwinists, and, when it might occur, as a result of extreme solar or unnatural nuclear activity, does not cause any non-lethal cellular or 'evolutionary' changes. 'Mutation', however, is a staple of this religion, and the popular misunderstanding of its mechanics and rather fictitious nature allowed it to also become a staple of twentieth century science, science fiction and super-hero fiction, to the extent, in fact, that it has become an accepted explanation for many magical changes which happen to fictional characters in the super-hero genre, accepted as a reliable, scientific explanation by the audiences, hoodwinked by the mere mention of those 'clever' lexis: 'evolution' and 'mutation'.

The application of this religion to the movie allows for a depiction of the degradation of humanity, and thus an additional way to erode the self-confidence and existential self-justification of the audience, as the humans exchange places with the apes in the planetary-control hierarchy, whereby the apes are the 'fittest' in every way, their survival thus ensured, alongside the decline of an undeserving, patriarchal humanity. In the tunnels, when Nova asks Maurice if she is also an ape, and he simply replies that she is 'Nova', we are prompted to consider, through our investment in these characters, how it is more desirable to be an ape than a human. We are also being shown a 'new' kind of human, one who allies wholly with the causes and societal groups she is exposed to, the ones she is, as a blank slate, being programmed to attack or defend, a poster child for extreme leftism. As we witness the hapless humans fall prey to the mutated virus, as well as a symbolic extinction beneath the avalanche, we experience their humiliation, their inflated egos and unrealistic ambitions exposed and crushed. Presuming that the audience has some empathy with the humans in the story, they are being encouraged to look into the face of this abyss of humiliation and justified extinction, to confront the presumed worthlessness underlying their every waking moment, making it real, willing it into reality. It is the logical addendum to the demonisation of humanity. For those so



inclined, there is even the mention of this fate being a natural retribution, perhaps to restore an ecological equilibrium, as The Colonel says, 'The irony is, we created you; nature has been punishing us for our arrogance', an Edenic type of divine retribution: humanity is to be rejected for its sinful behaviour, and the audience is invited to consider its own arrogance; more doubling down on the weaponisation of wildlife welfare and ecological welfare.

## Narrative: other

Another notable feature is the reference to war, its perpetuity being recognised as one of the chief strategies deployed in the cause of population reduction since the 1950s; the culling of us; the genocide of us, or at least experimentation with such. Besides being highlighted in the title, this is densely featured from the start, with the Vietnam war-type scenario in the forest, the soldiers outfitted in that style familiar from the many Hollywood representations of that FWO scam, the appearance of the helicopters in the final battle, the kong/vietcong reference, the slogans adorning the military hardware and clothing, and the 'Apocalypse Now' references of The Colonel as Colonel Kurtz, the 'APE-POCALYPSE' graffiti in the tunnel below the base, and the inclusion of a Jimi Hendrix music track. The latter is an interesting, contemptuous aside, invoking the Laurel Canyon military operation during that war, in which many young non-musicians were drafted to join the establishment of an engineered, FWO-generated music industry in Los Angeles, serving the militarised cultural agenda back home by advancing the modus operandi of degenerate music and culture. War references also include the Winston Churchill namesake, the constant presence of The Colonel's battalion, the 'liberating' army coming from the north, the World War Two camp references, the plight of the refugees, and the battalion's base, which 'used to be a weapons depo'. Besides this, the entire context is one of perpetual war, something which is only avoided once all humans have been escaped or destroyed. This provides an atmosphere and overriding purpose of unabating antagonism, fear and misery, and this has its own purpose, of course, like everything else intended to program us with such emotions. Furthermore, war is seen to be a weakness of men specifically, wrought by them in governing or military positions, and giving them purpose. Perhaps this is the main reason for reminding us of it so forcefully here; war can remind us, on top of all the other incidental reminders, that men are basically mad, bad and dangerous, which is a double cruelty, of course, since war has always been engineered not by men, per-se, but primarily as a business venture by the tiniest minority in the secretive, satanic echelons of the FWO, with men, specifically, being the ones always the most exploited by it, exposed to the most hideous experiences and paying the ultimate price for the financial gain of those others.

On another note, the idea of the mute human, if we consider ourselves as such, is an interesting one. The very reticent Preacher, for instance, represents those of us who are in a position to speak out against the brotherhoods of the FWO, but do not or cannot do so, while all of us, regardless of our knowledge, are deprived of any effective voice or platform with which we might share our thoughts, feelings and opinions. In terms of governance, none of us have ever been asked for our consent, permission or opinion on any single issue which directly affects our lives, while, if we make any use of media at all, being constantly and repetitively lied to about everything; we have no option, unless we opt out completely from every conceivable interaction with culture, media or society at every level, but to be exposed to the bellowing voice and onslaught of the propaganda of the FWO; the propaganda is a major player in the war we are born into, and we have no right of reply. Our muteness is compounded by the combination of the resulting ignorance, the dumbing-down agenda, and the attack on our health and well-being. For this reason, like Preacher, we are easily manipulated, confused and misled, and, like him, we would have no platform to express disagreement with or opposition to the weapons arrayed against us, or any way to counteract the weaponised rhetoric, should we choose to do so. Like Nova, in fact, we do not even have the words, and will never be afforded the mental development inherent in the ability to develop language. In this, our voiceless predicament is cynically thrust into our faces in the guise of Preacher, the

ideologically deceived slave, following orders for the sake of a hopeless and empty cause, and of Nova, the blank slate on which nothing will be written and about whom nothing will be noted or remembered.

Finally, in considering all possibilities, and knowing exactly the way our enemy plays this game, we might consider how the extreme winter weather conditions we witness in the movie could serve the purpose of subtly supporting the CCH, with the most telling aspect of this being the symbolic human extinction beneath the avalanche. Not only are we strikingly relieved, in the sudden removal of the humans, of the intense stress we have been feeling on the part of Caesar's tribe throughout the movie, but we also witness that it is nature, with a helping hand from Caesar, in his role as uncorrupted nature personified, which conspires to obliterate them, much like the punishment it administers by mutating the virus to their detriment, as posited by The Colonel. This is the same nature, of course, which the CCH has declared to be dangerously unstable due to humanity's activity, now providing an appropriate end to their unruly dominance, as if this were representative of the kind of revenge we have been told we deserve. Although it is not one of the main Narratives of this particular movie, it intersects with the wider CCH narrative, allowing us immediate recognition of this as divine retribution according to that dogma.

# 6

## Bates Motel

(‘television’ series) 2013 - 2017

### discussion

The length of time involved in viewing an entire series, as well as being a testament to the quality of the production itself, is a considerable commitment on the part of the viewer. The time invested by the viewer allows for greater empathy with characters, in the way that happens with traditional soap opera characters, due to the time spent inhabiting their lives. The more time someone spends in the company of such work, and the more it takes a real place in one’s life, the more one is willing to align with its attributes or propositions. One continues spending the time only if one finds reasons to do so, which becomes a reflection on oneself, and the personal investment and justification for continuing leads to greater investment and commitment to the product as time passes. Such an effect, bordering on the irrationality inherent in the ‘Rodney King’ effect, is comparable to reading a novel, while a comparison can also be made to religious texts, notably those of the Abrahamic religions. These religions not only rely on these texts for their legitimacy, but also infiltrate the lives of their adherents extensively and indefinitely due to their length and the amount of time which the adherents need to spend in the company and alternative reality of those texts. This is arguably or evidently why such extensive texts were one of the requirements of the designers of those religions, and we can label this effect ‘the Qur’anic principle’.

Furthermore, this time allows, unlike the movie format, for the development of storylines in what appears to be more like real time; real-time storylines in movies are rare, and characterisation and reality rather forced by an inability of the characters to react slowly, for instance, pausing extensively, perhaps, in conversation, or to deliberate decisions in a believable manner. Since the overall story of a series is spread out in time, this would appear, in terms of propagandising, to allow for the inclusion of a larger number of Narratives. However, although this is apparent in some of the more episodically insular serieses, such as ‘The Good Doctor’ (2017 - ), this is seldom the preferred option, presumably because it can appear unrealistic or disjointed, and can interfere with the integrity and continuity of the storyline. Rather, a series most often makes use of this time to reiterate selective propaganda Narratives, and one can easily see the appeal of this, since repetition of exposure, as with ‘the Qur’anic principle’, results in memorisation, as well as validation-by-default, of the content, regardless of its merit.

As with the widely appreciated series, ‘Breaking Bad’ (2008 - 2013), ‘Bates Motel’ (with 50 episodes across five seasons, totaling approximately 37 hours) makes use of a finite storyline, providing the relief of closure at the end, when the main characters have been dispatched, and there is no realistic way to extend the storyline further, short of spinoffs and prequels, of which this series is already one in itself, intriguingly foreshadowing the storyline of the movie, Psycho, released in 1960, with ‘Bates Motel’ set in the present. This is an example of the heights of creativity applied to this project, so well-crafted as to fall into the category of art, even to the point of deserving the label ‘classic’, and

attracting the ongoing attention of audiences into the future, an apparently intentional fringe benefit previously mentioned specifically in relation to 'Blade Runner 2049'. If there is any doubt regarding the artistic merit of 'Bates Motel', one should consider a few points which evidence the very great attention paid to detail and message, but which could be easily overlooked, although they add to the integrity and texture of the whole, letting us know that we are in the presence of a great work. The first is the utterance of a single word, 'mother', in the last moment of season 2, episode 5 (2.5) which, being the end of the 25th episode of 50 episodes, is at the exact halfway moment of the series. In fact, this word is yelled desperately - 'Mother!!' - at the top of the protagonist's, Norman Bates's, voice, the placement of the word, as well as the character shouting it, signifying the overriding centrality of the mother, Norma Bates, and her relationship with Norman, to the storyline, which also happens to intersect with the main Narratives. 'MOTHER' (note the capitalisation), we later learn (3.5), also happens to be the designated motel wi-fi password.

Another such symbolic incident is the occasion when Norman, after being released from the psychiatric ward of the county hospital, is locked by Norma in her bedroom, because she is concerned about his disappearing or endangering others (4.1). In trying to escape the room, he breaks through the door which joins their two bedrooms, leaving the door utterly irreparable. This metaphor signifies the point when the Norma personality starts to take over Norman's personality more frequently and consciously, the division in his mind between the two finally giving way.

More crafted detail is apparent in the taxidermy and death motif, another major theme, where this is underpinned by Norman's preference for watching old movies; this is the only thing he ever watches. It is easily deduced that everyone involved in the production of these movies is deceased, so they parallel Norman's taxidermy hobby, as well as foreshadowing his imagined animation of Norma's corpse throughout the final season; in his mind, the deceased remains alive, speaking and moving as in life, for which the old movies are, again, a perfect metaphor.

Not only this, but the movies are also selected for their content. In the opening moments of the first episode, for instance, we are witness to a dialogue from the movie 'His Girl Friday' (1940) in which someone is quizzically asking a friend, who is moving to another city, if he is going to live with his mother. 'Just for the first year', comes the almost-regretful answer, thus segueing us into an overarching theme of the series. The movies mentioned rather highlight the fact that Hollywood product has only ever been about social engineering, although the number of Narratives in a given product, as mentioned, was always limited compared to more recent ones. 'His Girl Friday', for instance, like many movies of its era, is about divorce, instigated, of course, by a self-righteous wife because of the various inadequacies of her husband. In this case, the ex-husband remains jealous of his wife, and tries to prevent her from finding another man, the narratives being: the man is undesirable and the less valuable one, rejected; the woman is desirable and the more valuable one, pursued, able to make her choices without constraint or fear of rejection. Since the narratives have never changed, but only been augmented in number and degree, direct links can be made to more recent Hollywood products, which in the case of 'His Girl Friday' would specifically mean increasingly weaponised feminism. Other moments of movies featured include 'Meet John Doe' (1941) and 'Double Indemnity' (1944), which are premised on suicide and murder, respectively, and feature at a point when these have become inescapable components of the overarching theme of death in the series.

Another movie mentioned (4.2) is 'Key Largo' (1948), which contains elements reminiscent of 'Bates Motel': a visitor to a remote hotel is trapped for days, alongside a mafia boss and his entourage, by a typhoon raging outside. Having accompanied the hotel owner's son in a wartime battlefield and at his death, he is there to commiserate with the widowed father and the son's widow. The mafia boss is an egotistical bully, and is there to make a counterfeit money deal, involving smugglers from Cuba on a boat at sea, and ends up killing the deputy sheriff. The hero ends up killing the entire mafia gang and escaping to live happily ever after with the widow. Theoretically, In 'Bates Motel', the storm would represent the world outside, as perceived by Norman, and the hotel would parallel the isolated Bates house, and the way that both Norman and Norma end up being trapped there, at one time or

another. While Norman could be the dead son, Dylan would be the outsider who ends up winning the widow, who would be Emma, and the movie's involvement of a killed deputy sheriff, a sheriff who survives, illegal activities being undertaken by a mafia group, the featuring of a single-parent-type relationship between the father and the widow, and the killing of a number of people in the end, all conspire to lend this movie a flavour very suggestive of that of 'Bates Motel', and is thus another example of the extent to which such detail is carefully considered.

On a lighter note, one is reminded of Dickens's playfulness in the selection of fictional characters' names, when we meet Emma Decody, with her surname an adjectival reference to her role as witness to the Bates family intrigues, as if she were the eyes through which we might be seeing and interpreting this story. There is also the female pulling Norman from the other side during the same time, Cody. Thus, besides having a 'decoder', we also have a 'coder'; it is Cody's job to complicate Norman's life, rather than trying to simplify it. Other name wordplay arises with the two Sams, both destined to be killed by Norman. Also, Norman's own name is rhymed with that of his mother, Norma, the point being that they are, essentially, one inseparable identity. Finally, there is also a second Dylan, son of an apparently single mother who checks into the motel in the final episode.

And then there is Juno, the female dog who appears and is then killed by a car (1.7), which is partly Norman's doing, and then reappears in Norman's imagination a number of times thereafter, a sign that he has entered a trance or schizophrenic state. Named after the Roman goddess of battle and fertility, Juno is a metaphor for Bradley Martin, the girl who appears rather briefly in Norman's life and is then, much later, killed by him (3.10), while he is under his Norma persona. From the outset, Bradley Martin represents the main sexual threat to intrude upon the Oedipal equilibrium of Norman and Norma's life together, and is emblematic of a life which Norman can never have. Like Juno, we sense that the idea of being with Bradley Martin never quite leaves him in peace. Juno appears for only the second time when Norman is in a rage over Bradley Martin's rejection of him, and is instantly killed, as if this sudden death by proxy could satisfy his hatred of Bradley Martin. Later, as Norman is trying to physically escape away from a hallucination in which his mother is sexually flirting with him, running along the road at night, away from the motel, the imagined Juno magically appears and overtakes him, leading him to find the returned Bradley Martin, looking as if she has really returned from the grave, standing on a bridge at the edge of town (3.8). Juno is thus inextricably and metaphorically tied to the Bradley Martin character, another sign of the extent to which the writers have gone to craft a complex and multi-faceted work which is high in artistic integrity.

There is also, as with 'Blade Runner 2049' and 'War for the Planet of the Apes' (2017), for instance, an array of tributes to the original movie, an attention to detail easily omitted, and a sign of artistic dedication to the inspiration for the project. With 20 directing credits, 17 writing credits, and 27 producer credits, besides being a masterpiece of coordination and design, it is apparent that 'Bates Motel' is a very thoroughly planned piece of work, deserving of attention and analysis, though only after we have inured ourselves against its propagandistic toxicity. The themes are all very strong and fully exploited, being carefully managed to take them all as far as they can be taken within a viable storyline. Once we have been attuned to the content and context, through the exposure to a number of episodes, we can be lulled by its familiarity, by our own expectations, and impressed by the clarity of its messages as determined by those Narratives which serve the overarching Agenda. These have been carefully selected in the recipe as being appropriate for the storyline, and rather than these few being muddled by the introduction of a wide range of Narratives, are, instead, reiterated and restated, driven home through flashbacks, verbal comments, or simply images, making them work as well as they could be expected to. This piece of work is a fine example of the culmination of at least a century of harnessing fiction to propaganda, a forthright display of those skills developed and finely tuned, expertly puppeteered from the shadows, and due to our particular insight into its purpose, easily inviting our admiration as much as our censure.

# Narrative 1: familial estrangement

In terms of the portrayal and encouragement of the destruction of familial relationships, common enough inside and outside of Hollywood products, this series is second to none in taking us to the extremities of this narrative. In speaking of those relationships here, we are referring to their most negative aspects, specifically: murderously violent familial antagonism, extreme familial estrangement, and incest, the latter for which 'Bates Motel' is an apologist of the first order, and helping to make this particular Narrative apparently the primary one in this series. Regarding the family unit, and familial estrangement generally, this is paramount among the FWO targets, since the dismantling of the family ensures the disintegration of society and culture because it contributes greatly to emotional, psychological and societal instability. Other propaganda narratives and FWO targets such as race, the CCH, gender, and falsified history, pale in significance beside that of the war on the family, while the gender narrative overlaps with it to a great extent.

It has long been beyond obvious to many people that the programming of expectations and behaviour, in Hollywood products, dictates that, especially regarding 'WE' peoples, as many family ties as possible need to be removed from a storyline's characters. It has already been mentioned how we are often presented with young adults arising out of a void, and that, in many cases, this means we are dealing with orphaned children, too, with the parents either removed as part of the back-story, or killed off within the storyline in order to generate trauma and irreconcilable loss for the child, and thus for the audience. If family life is to be a part of the storyline, however, it must be a single-parent one which, in nearly every case, means the absence of the father or husband, rather than the mother, while those fathers or husbands who do exist either remain in the shadows or are presented for ridicule, demonisation, and as an obstacle or threat to the well-being of the wife and children. In fact, this Narrative is so prevalent and so long-standing that most consumers of Hollywood product in 'WE' societies believe this to be a self-evident truth in reality, such that, according to the deep understanding of human psychology which the FWO has long possessed, and which they have forever employed along with other useful weapons to direct such beliefs in its war on humanity, eventually, for increasing numbers of people, it becomes part of their reality.

Incest is promoted as another attack, alongside rabid and wildly disproportionate promotion of the alphabet minority (so-called 'lgbt' etc.), on healthy and mentally sustainable familial relationships, as well as normal sexual relationships generally, serving the aforementioned ultimate goals. Using the trojan horse of an anemically professed abhorrence of incest, to keep the audience on-side, it is nevertheless normalised, partly through mere exposure to the topic, as if incestuous behaviour were widespread; we are presented with strong characters we increasingly come to relate to and empathise with, in whose lives incest plays a part. The immediate aim of this is to contribute to an increase of estrangement and animosity between relatives, expectations of breakdown of family relationships, and an increase in the incidence of incest, including familial rape, as well as to remove much of its shock value, and to generally promote further extremes of degeneracy and perversion, or the widespread and genuine acceptance of such. While such a despicable activity as sexual relations with close family members would only be practised by a few people on the planet, and would remain abhorrent to practically everyone, regardless of this exposure, the aim, instead, is the dehumanisation of anyone merely being exposed to the topic.

In 'Bates Motel', as an archetype for the said themes, we are confronted with the extreme case of incest on two counts. Firstly, there is the pre-storyline history of Norma's rape by her brother, a frequent occurrence lasting years during their early teens, although the veracity of the extent to which this may have been consensual is left open, in order to benefit from being able to push the themes of both rape and incest simultaneously. Not only this, but it is exploited by being referenced multiple times, sometimes with flashbacks of Norma and Caleb as children, as if this visual support provides some kind of proof of such events within the storyline, even though such events remain undepicted. The theme is laboured in this way, with comments such as Caleb's would-be confession to Dylan, 'She was more than a sister to me [...]. You can't help who you love' (3.4). And, when Caleb turns up to apologise for this past crime, carrying flowers, she ends up inviting him in for

dinner, to which Emma and Alex Romero are also invited, making for a public declaration and tacit validation of that incest (3.7). Furthermore, even though his provenance also remains unresolved, Dylan is presented as their son, with Caleb being both his uncle and father, though Dylan refers to him as the latter, since fathers are always one of the main targets, rather than uncles. Thus, the persistent presence of Dylan in the storyline is a constant reminder of this incest; regardless of whether Caleb is truly Dylan's father, Dylan remains the touchstone for the incest theme, making it as pervasive as that of death.

The other incestuous relationship is the Oedipal one between Norma and her other son, the story's main character, Norman. Again, no sexually intimate relationship is depicted, and in fact, does not exist in a literal sense. Rather, it exists as explosive potential, as something circumstantially suggested, and even verbally referred to, the power of this being enough to serve the purpose, as well as contribute towards the dynamism of Norman and Norma's relationship, and Norman's mental condition. This perverse infatuation which Norman has with his mother, highlighted in the first episode and augmented as the series progresses, is the premise of the original movie storyline, and is evidently one of the reasons why the movie was considered such a worthwhile subject for this development. Unlike Norma's sexual history with her brother, however, there is no victim in this Oedipal theme. One of its purposes is to help propagate the message that no relationship between any male and female can be normal, as traditionally understood; although the removal of the father from family life, as well as the removal of unrelated male-female relationships, both in the world of fiction and that of reality, had been well-established, this male-female relationship, between mothers and their sons, remained, and thus became a new prime target for disruption and destruction, having been underplayed in Hollywood product thus far. We are therefore presented with a mother-son relationship which is dangerously fraught, with a young man's need for independence, alongside a mother who cares for her son to excess - loving to a fault - being the cause of their estrangement, with Norman's burgeoning sexual infatuation with his mother becoming a complicating factor which establishes, with a note of finality, that any closeness between mother and son is doomed to fail. This of course is the entire premise of the story: that Norman has been permanently damaged by the closeness of his relationship with his mother. Although it would appear that this was also the premise of the original movie, the augmentation here includes the further cause of the couple being rather pushed into such intimacy by the domestic terror inflicted on them by the pre-storyline father figure, Sam. This fact is reiterated and paralleled by the repeated reference to the childhood circumstances of siblings Norma and Caleb, as they and their mother were similarly terrorised by their father.

The naming pun combining the two characters of Norma and Norman into one person supports the consciously Oedipal theme, the chief component of the Freudian interpretation of which this series aligns with to a very large extent: the son has killed the father and both he and his mother are committed to each other in the way that lovers are, albeit platonically. Since, in this case, the mother and son are aware of the nature of their relationship, the narrative is allowed to play out as a kind of sequel to the original myth, as mother and son, becoming conscious of the bond, develop a mutual enmity, resulting in Norman's killing her. The prophetic nature of this, because it foreshadows the movie of half a century earlier, injects a note of inevitability into the relationship and, by the usual extrapolation, is intimated as being a fixed component of all mother-son or parent-son, or even any bi-gendered relationships: doomed to failure. Incidentally, in the Oedipus versions by Sophocles and Homer, the mother, Jocasta, kills herself. The equivalent here occurs when Norman kills his mother, since son and mother are the same person, being mutually metaphorical, thus allowing for this murder to make a double entry as suicide, as part of the death Narrative.

The Oedipal suggestions are present from the first episode, during which mother and son openly declare their undying attachment to each other more than once. We see Norman viewing his mother in her lingerie through her bedroom window, meanwhile painting him, in his pausing at the unsolicited sight, as a 'peeping tom', helping with the demonisation of all men. This is reinforced when he spies on Norma having sex in a motel room with Alex Romero (4.8). Indeed, this unfortunate predilection of Norman's, sexually passive, emasculating, exploitative, and dishonest, is expanded upon with the peephole he uses to spy on other women from the motel's office, and

repeated when he is caught by Norma spying on Annika in her motel room (3.1). In the second episode, the message is reinforced, and attention overtly drawn to his relationship with Norma, when she scolds Norman for insinuating that she should not be undressing in front of him, saying, 'I'm your mother! It's not like it's weird or anything', which rather spotlights the theme for the less attentive viewer's benefit. At this point, he expresses his jealousy at her seeing Zak Shelby by telling her, 'I don't want you to go', a scene later replayed in her liaison with George Heldens, and then more fatefully with Alex Romero. This is further articulated when Norman confronts Norma again about Zak Shelby (1.4). When she accuses him of being jealous, he replies, 'I'm not jealous. You're my mother; not my girlfriend'. The extent of his jealousy, and its physiological effect, is seen when, after he sees Norma hugging George Heldens, he has to rush outside for air (2.7). And later, following Norma's death, he demonstrates how he has projected his own feelings onto Norma when he tells the investigator that Norma had been upset because she had had to leave her new husband, Alex Romero, after realising that he had married her to 'get at' her, and to get Norman 'out of the way' (4.10). Oedipal jealousy is also a factor after her death, as when Norman is allowed to see Norma's corpse. He removes her wedding ring, while our focus is drawn to this through the perspective of Sabel, the embalmer's daughter, who watches him without comment, reminding us both that newcomers to the story would easily be able to identify Norman as mentally disturbed, and that his extreme jealousy exists within the realm of acceptability.

Care is also taken to show Norma being jealous in return. This first occurs in when she attempts to stop Norman going out with Bradley Martin (1.1). Later on, Norma takes Emma out to lunch in order to fish for information about Bradley Martin, and is obviously inflamed at the sight of her when Emma points her out in the street (1.7). In that same episode, when Norman has befriended the stray dog, Juno, Norma tells him to stay away from 'her', while we are already being encouraged to read Juno as a representation of Bradley Martin. As if to make this point clear, this admonition is immediately followed by Norma warning Norman to stay away from Bradley Martin, too. Much later in the story (5.2), after her death, when seeing Madeleine Loomis from inside Norman's car, she tells Norman that Madeleine Loomis looks like her, Norma, and invokes their own Oedipal relationship by asking him, 'Are you going to be one of those guys?', meaning one who marries a mother-figure. This idea is borne out when Norman takes some of Norma's dresses to offer to Madeleine Loomis, instead of dumping them, and then brings her flowers while she is wearing one of the dresses (5.4). This is aptly encapsulated by Norman when he tells her, 'it's hard to know what's real in any moment'. [You said it, Norman].

We are also treated to a number of instances when Norman and Norma express their devotion to one another which, even taking the context into consideration, remind us of things which young lovers might say to each other. From the start, when they are disposing of their first corpse together in the boat, Norman tells her, 'You're everything, everything to me, and I don't ever want to live in the world without you. You're [...] my whole life, my whole self. You always have been (1.1). When he adds that 'It's like there's a cord between our hearts', she mentions that this line is from the novel, 'Jane Eyre', which, while pretending to dispel the Oedipal tension, also serves to enhance the lovers theme. In her reply, before telling him, 'We belong to each other' and 'I love you, Norman. You're the best thing that has ever happened to me', she says 'It's you and me. It's always been you and me', exactly the same phrase she uses later on (2.5), as if this is a consciously-placed piece, habitually reiterated even at times to which we are not witness. Literature figures again (4.2) when Norman reads Norma a passage from 'Great Expectations' which easily applies to their own relationship, that being another story of long-term, frustrated and unconsummated love. Just before lying down to sleep beside Norma in what he has planned to be a joint suicide (4.9), Norman suggests moving, running away together for a fresh start, since they agree that they are supposed to be together, he says, 'forever', before singing her to sleep. Among a number of other such instances, there is Norma's statement to Norman that 'We would die without each other' (5.1) and Norman's final utterance in the series (5.10), when he tells Dylan, 'I can't let you take me away from her'.



Of course, we also see Norman and Norma sharing a bed on other occasions besides that on which he kills her, such as in when Norma asks to sleep with Norman in his bed when they are making up one of their 'lovers' quarrels (1.9); when Norman asks to sleep in Norma's bed with her because the house is cold (4.8); and when Norman wakes in Norma's bed beside her and hugs her (3.1), while later in the same episode, they are seen watching a movie in her bed together. In fact, this appears to be the norm for them until Dylan comments on it. Links to outsider lovers occur, too, as when Norma and Norman are in her bed together and she leaves him there as she goes to visit Alex Romero to ask him to marry her (4.1), and then when Madeleine Loomis, to whom Norman is attracted because of her resemblance to his mother, phones while Norman is in bed next to a hallucinated Norma (5.4), to invite him over for dinner. This also occurs among more overtly sexual references, such as when Norma bursts into Norman's bedroom in the morning, interrupting his fantasising about Bradley Martin, creating a direct link between sexual intercourse with Bradley Martin and with Norma (1.7). The idea of their sexual intimacy, from Norman's side at least, becomes a real issue in season three when James Finnigan asks him directly, 'Norman, do you want to sleep with her?', while later on, as a 1920s tune, 'Tonight You Belong to Me', is playing, we see Norman by a sleeping Norma, on her bed caressing her blanketed form and realising that what James Finnigan had suggested might be correct (3.7). Thereafter, Norman becomes agitated when Norma comes in to wake him, and later he confesses to her what James Finnigan had asked him (3.8). At this point, the Oedipal apology in Norma's response serves for a fuller range of sexual deviancy when she not only tells him that there is nothing wrong with him, and that, while they hug on her bed, 'It doesn't mean you're weird [...]. You can't help what you think, what your impulses are', but also that 'We all have crazy ones [...]. People dream about sleeping with their parents, their teachers, their dogs. It's just how we're wired'. Following this, after Norma has gone out, he hallucinates her flirting with him, while the inevitability of their intimacy is reinforced when she says, as he tries to escape her, 'You can't run away from me', which is confirmed when, accompanied by a similarly hallucinated Juno, he discovers the returned Bradley Martin standing in the road, now established as a sexual proxy for Norma.

Finally, there is an array of instances when Norman and Norma behave with each other like lovers. At the outset, they enter the new house like young lovers starting their life together, something echoed when he suggests moving again, running away together for a fresh start, and they agree they are supposed to be together, as he says, 'forever' (4.9). Also in the first episode, Norma becomes visibly upset, and makes an obvious display of this for Norman's benefit, when he arrives home late for dinner. She is further provoked by the mention of Blaire Watson, as if she were a lover's rival, and attacks him with, 'I'll just do everything myself, the way I always do', and they eat dinner in silence (1.1). Later in the first season, because Norman has visited Bradley Martin, Norma's arch rival in this respect, she tells him, 'You do not care about me', which upsets him (1.5). When he retaliates by telling her that she scares him, and that she might need help, she forces him to get out of the car and walk home. After the incident when Norma catches Norman spying on Annika Johnson, and she ends up crying in bed, he goes to apologise like a repentant lover (3.1). Another time, Norma is cooking breakfast when Norman asks her, 'do you still like me?' citing her improving relationship with Dylan, which has roused his jealousy (3.4). Later on, while he is being moody with her, she makes the peculiar comment that this is not masculine or attractive (3.7), and when Norman tells Norma he's leaving her, it is played like a lover's departure (3.10). He tells her, 'In many ways, I just think we've been horrible for each other [...]. I don't think we're good together [...]. It would be for the best that we separate', following which, she knocks him unconscious and imprisons him in the basement, to prevent him leaving. When Dylan, Emma and Norman accompany Norma to buy a Christmas tree, Norman apologises to the others for Norma's foul mood, as if this were his duty as a spouse (4.8). Finally, when Caleb offers to stay and help Norma with Norman, she says it could never work because they are both in love with her (5.3). 'But he's your son', says Caleb, as if to underline the point, after which another point is underlined when she replies, 'And you're my brother'.

No self-respecting familial estrangement Narrative would be complete without the obligatory motif of the orphaned or single-parented child, often as a central theme, and 'Bates Motel' is far from

being an exception to this. Being a long-running series, we meet a large number of characters with fraught familial circumstances along these lines, which rather emphasises and epitomises the fact that no Hollywood product can portray a regular, normal-functioning family; even making allowances for the need to set up flawed characters and dynamic storylines, this would not account for a complete absence of such families, even as peripheral characters. As if to allow us an outsider's snapshot of this, to draw our jaded attention to it again, Norman checks a lady into the motel, with her two sons, one of whom is called Dylan (5.10). Incidentally, this is an odd detail, which serves to rein in any notion we might have of how the fantastically aberrant circumstances of the Bates family, at a point in the story when these have unraveled to an absurd extent, could never occur in reality, now bringing us momentarily back to earth to show us how 'this' can become 'that', bridging the gap between something realistic we might witness in our lives, and the most extreme domestic dysfunctionality.

The common 'Bambi' scenario, of a child losing a parent to death, begins with Norman losing his father in the first scene, and is soon followed by both Bradley Martin and Cody losing their fathers, while Marion Crane also tells Norman about the loss of her father (5.6). The end of the storyline sees the additional orphaning of Norman, with Norma's demise (4.10). Norma, of course, loses her own mother along the way, as does Emma, whose loss is rather dragged out through the unresolved status of her mother's death at Norman's hands (from 4.1 to 5.9). Before her move to Seattle, Emma lives with her father only, and we are also exposed to this single-parenting 'norm' with Cody, and with Norman, along with his brother, Dylan, who is presented as simultaneously single-parented and orphaned, being an outsider of the impenetrable family nucleus of Norma and Norman, and also spending a lifetime without his father until the itinerant Caleb enters his life for a short time; Dylan is abandoned again by Caleb (3.10), and ultimately orphaned by Caleb's death (5.3). We also learn that Alex Romero lost his mother through suicide, besides losing his father to a long-term prison sentence (3.7). On the other hand, there are losses of children, occurring for Nick Ford with the death of Blaire Watson, and for Bradley Martin's mother when Bradley Martin runs away leaving a suicide note.

This general flavour, coupled with neglect of children by parents, is apparent in other significant references scattered throughout the storyline. The general idea, of course, goes beyond the Bambi baseline to impress upon the viewer that people are unable and/or unwilling not only to remain committed to their life partners, but also unable and/or unwilling to bring up their children with due care. This also extends to the idea that children would be better off living independently, without parental interference, something very close to the main premise of the storyline. We begin in the first minutes of the series when Norman tells Norma, 'I'm so happy you're making me move here. You're so smart to force me to do things I have no say in'. Then, Nick Ford tells Norma he was estranged from his daughter when she died (2.8), and Marion Crane tells Norman, 'Parents can be a bitch [...]. My dad didn't want me [...]. When I was 15, I got a bus to Seattle and I've been on my own ever since' (5.6). Annika Johnson tells Norman that she never knew her father (3.1), while in the same episode, Norma receives a phone call about her mother's death. Although the lawyers are trying to dispose of her mother's estate, she says she is not interested, and when telling Norman the news, says that it does not mean anything to her, and that they had not spoken for twenty years. Soon afterwards, when Norman finds her crying because of the news, it transpires that she is grieving because it reminded her that she 'never had a mother'. Reflecting on her own experience, she tells Dylan, after they discover that Caleb has left town without warning him (3.10), 'People are generally disappointing'. Later, we are witness to a flashback Caleb has, of himself and Norma as children, practically parentless as they hide from one of their father's violent episodes, as he tells Chick Hogan of their childhood deprivations at mother's hands, saying, 'Our mom was crazy' (5.3). As Norma has already puts it to Alex Romero, 'Our whole life was a torture, and we were all we had' (4.6). Of course, the parental abandonment of children also features at that pivotal moment in the series, the aforementioned midway point at the conclusion when Norma runs away, abandoning both Norman and Dylan (3.5). Later on, after her return, Dylan tells her that she's never been a real mother to him, and says he's 'done' (4.9), showing us again that the abandonment can go both

ways. In fact, he leaves for Seattle to live with Emma, and goes for two years without knowing of Norma's death.

The idea of parental fallibility is reinforced outside the realm of the Bates family on many occasions, especially with regard to fathers, but parents are also specifically castigated, when Emma tells Norman, 'We all whitewash our parents' sins' (3.5), and when Julian tells him, 'Parents: can't live with them, can't live without them', then thinking better of this, adds, 'Actually, I can totally live without them' (4.3). In the case of Bradley Martin, whose parents are rather sidelined, we are introduced to the idea that the child-parent relationship is purely a financial one, when she tells Norman, 'You try living on your own without any money; without any parents' (3.9), after which they discover how she seems to have been materially replaced in her mother's house and life, since her former bedroom has been turned into an exercise room. Such apparent absence of feeling is echoed in Norma's statement to James Finnigan about how terrible it is to be a parent (3.6). And then there is the conspiracy of state weaponry in such estrangement, suggested when a hospital doctor tells Norma that social services will be visiting her, regarding Norman's welfare, a subtle threat which evokes the terror of child-kidnapping inflicted on families by the FWO-sanctioned CPS (4.1). Finally, there is a brief moment when we are invited to ponder the fact that couples may not be able to, or perhaps not wish to, reproduce, when Norman checks a couple with an adopted child into the motel (4.2), and in Bradley Martin's statement about reproduction being 'a really bad plan' (1.4). What we are to take away from all this, to apply to our own lives, with an expectation that we should or will never be part of others' lives, as well as the perennial element of mistrust of everyone, is summed up and justified by Marion Crane when she tells Norman, 'It's hard to be lonely, but it's also hard to love people [...]. We need people, but that need can destroy us [...]. And who even knows [...] if that person is who you really think they are' (5.6).

Besides an array of scenes where shouting aggressively or threateningly at each other is shown to be a regular part of the Bates home life, physical violence also plays its part, not only regarding back-story events referencing violent fathers and husbands, but also as part of the events we are witness to. This often supports the death Narrative, since attempts or threats to kill each other is also sometimes a part of the scenario. In terms of back-stories, Cody, whom Norman later overhears fighting at home with her violent father (2.5), cites an occasion when her grandmother attacked Cody's aunt's ex-husband with a baseball bat, in an attempt to persuade Norman of the righteousness and efficacy of attacking Caleb to scare him away (2.4). In this episode, as a result, Norman attacks Caleb with a knife, in trying to kill him, in an early outing of his Norma persona. Then, when Norma uses a gun to destroy her phone, there is a flashback of her parents fighting, with herself and Caleb hiding, waiting for their drunk father to pass out (3.6). This is later reiterated with Caleb experiencing a similar memory of them hiding and listening to the sounds of their father's violence, presumably being perpetrated against their mother (5.3). Furthermore, Norman imagines his father's, Sam's, voice telling him that Norma had killed him (4.2), and during a therapy session, Norman, again in his Norma persona, explains that it would crush Norman to discuss his father, and describes a time when she tried to leave him (4.6). The flashback shows Sam with a gun, grabbing Norman then raping her while Norman is hiding under the bed where this occurs. Such events are reinforced when Dylan tells Emma that Norma had told him that Norman had killed his father, Sam, explaining that 'He was a really bad guy; he used to beat the shit out of my mom all the time', and follows this by telling Emma that he believes Norman killed Emma's mother, too (5.5).

Among the domestic violence within the storyline, early on, Norman attempts to kill his own brother, with Norman coming off the worse for this (1.2), and this is echoed towards the end of the series when Norman, as Norma, tries to kill Dylan again (5.7). In this case, Norman's persona intervenes and a fight ensues between Norman and Norma, which the Norman side of him wins. In fact, this is the culmination of a long struggle which Norman has been having with Norma, even when she was alive, as seen when he tells her he doesn't trust her, and is afraid of her, saying 'There is only one way to stop it, and I don't want to do it', meaning that he might have to kill her (4.2). At this point, she runs to fetch her gun, but Norman has taken it already. After hiding in her room till nightfall, she emerges to find the house dark, then fetches a knife and proceeds to the basement, where she is

confronted by Norman pointing the gun at her, at which point Norman suggests their joint suicide, although this also definitely includes the possibility that mother and son kill each other. Regarding Caleb, who seems marked for destruction from the time he first shows up, Dylan, who is possibly his own son, in the time before they became close, unnecessarily points a gun at him (3.1), while they discuss Caleb's giving him some money as a gift. Later, Chick Hogan discusses with Norma their mutual interest in having Caleb killed, and tells her that it might feel good if she had a knife (4.5). Soon enough, Norma, after her own death, as part of Norman's personality, tells Norman to kill Caleb and loads a gun for him (5.3), and we thus soon see Norman in the basement with a captured, bound and unresisting Caleb with a gun to his head. In his Norma persona at this point, Norman tells Caleb that she doesn't want to hurt him - even though she does - but that Norman will probably have to kill him. Finally, regarding Norman's own death, this occurs at Dylan's hands when they have their third kitchen showdown (5.10), and Dylan shoots Norman after Norman has lunged at him with a knife, Norman's preferred weapon throughout the series.

There also occurs a range of instances of other, less violent familial animosity, such as when we are first introduced to Dylan, and discover that he has been estranged from the family; he is outside of the exclusive unit of Norma and Norman. Similar to when Norman does not tell him, later on, about their mother's death, he has not been told about the family's having moved to another town (1.1). In fact, when Dylan phones from Seattle, Norman tells him that it is best if they do not talk again, then puts the phone down. At first, we see that Dylan and Norma are very bitter towards each other. When he turns up, he has her listed as 'the whore' on his phone, and forever calls her 'Norma' rather than refer to her as his mother (1.2). When Ethan asks Dylan about his family, it becomes evident to him that they are far from close (1.3), while, when Dylan is picked up from hospital by Jody Morgan, and she asks him if he has any family they should call, he replies, 'No, they don't care about me' (2.6). And for their own sakes, he tells Norma and Norman, a number of times, that their relationship is unhealthy. Despite Dylan's estrangement, Norma warms to him, and by the time he is moving out of the family house once more, she tells him she cannot get through her present difficulties without him, but he responds with the comment that her being his mother is 'not much of a reason to stay' (1.5). When they part from each other for the final time, Norma behaves very coldly towards him, focussing angrily on her cooking, another sign that their relationship will always remain a love-hate one, their differences being irresolvable (4.6). Difficulties between the brothers are pushed to the limit again when Norman, having surreptitiously followed Dylan to his cabin, sees that Caleb has returned, and threatens to tell Norma, despite Dylan's pleading for him not to, as a way to keep Dylan from becoming closer to their mother (3.4). When Norman runs off to do this, Dylan catches him and physically attacks him, but this only confirms Norman in his jealous desire to tell Norma and destroy her relationship with Dylan. In the end, we see that there is no epitaph on Norman's gravestone, presumably as purchased by Dylan, the only one to survive the familial carnage (5.10).

Although we are allowed the exception that Norman and Norma's relationship is a perverse and peculiarly tormented one, illustrated in Norman's question of Norma, 'Who asked you to take care of me?', in response to her smothering statement, 'I know you better than you know yourself' (5.1), the idea that parents and their children might otherwise be close is also shown to be impossible, as we see, for instance, with Nick Ford and his daughter, the complete lack of reference to Chick Hogan's child, the contempt shown by Bradley Martin towards her mother, that of Cody towards her father, that of Alex Romero towards his (3.7), and the many references to Norma and Caleb's experience of their parents, referred to as a 'crappy upbringing' by James Finnigan (3.3). There is also an instance when Chick Hogan turns up at Dylan's cabin and, in mentioning that he was also a 'product of divorce', tells Dylan that he should know what Caleb is capable of, in a negative sense, of course (4.3). Also, while Emma has an ideal relationship with her father, she has only bad things to say about her mother, telling Dylan that 'She's not a very good person' (4.7). In fact, while both adults and older children do exist in the town, they are not shown to cohabit or live as families; they are nearly always shown separately, the exceptions being Norma and her sons, and Emma and her father. This widespread, tacit estrangement is pointed out when Cody asks Norman why Norma is special, and makes the surprised and somewhat mocking comment, 'You actually love your mom,

don't you' (2.4). This portrayal of the weakest of familial relationships is supported by Norma's comment to the lawyer, that 'Being a mother is an impossible job to win' (5.9); as she has already told Norman, 'You have no idea what it's like to be your mother. It's killing me. You're going to kill me, Norman!' (3.8).

Of course, in terms of parenting, there is an overlap with the usual gender Narratives, meaning that we need to be shown how terrible fathers are, rather than mothers, with Emma's father being the apparently more benevolent parent, the exception which proves the rule. There is one scene, however, where we are shown a less reasonable side to him, in his opposition to Emma's trying to contact her mother. Meanwhile, her mother, Audrey Ellis Decody, is shown to be a nice person, and we are given no reason why she should be resented; indeed, Emma is keen to be reunited with her, and might have achieved this had Audrey Ellis Decody not become one of Norman's murdered victims. No such sympathies are afforded the other fathers, however, and this is clear from the outset, with the evident pleasure displayed by Norman and Norma in their fresh start following Sam's death; fathers are bad and are not allowed to be shown to intrude upon anyone's lives. The removal of Norman's father is the subject of the opening scene, rather setting the tone, while we only see Bradley Martin's father once, at his car crash (1.2) which leads to his off-screen and unsung death (1.4). Cody's father is present only briefly, in order to show us how aggressive and violent he is, before being killed by Norman (2.6). We are led to believe that Nick Ford, being a villain, is the reason why he is estranged from his daughter, and are also shown how Alex Romero's father, again barely featuring, is the villain in his family, having, according to Alex Romero, driven Alex Romero's mother to suicide (3.7). Despite that, Alex Romero's father says that he loved her, which is reminiscent of the flashback Norman has during therapy (4.6): when he was seven, walking through the kitchen at home, his father, passed out drunk with his head on the kitchen table, Sam suddenly wakes up, grabs Norman and tells him that he loves him. Despite the sentiment, it is a terrifying scene for the child, and rather conveys to us the message that, whatever they might mean or say, being violent, destructive and angry is something they just cannot help; a congenital condition for men, which, in the storyline of this series, means 'WE' men.

Negative references to Sam arise often. Regarding Zak Shelby's blackmail, Norma tells Norman that he could make them do things they do not want to, 'just like your father did' (1.3). However, by the next episode, Norma has a brief spell of defending Zak Shelby against Norman's accusations, telling him, 'That's just because of your father, you can't actually believe that any man is actually kind', and when Zak Shelby asks Norman about his father, he says, 'Your mom tells me he was a little abusive; that he wasn't such a nice guy' (1.4). Then when Annika Johnson asks Norman about his father (3.1), Norman says 'He wasn't a very nice man', to which she responds that she did not know her father either. Later on, when Norman is at the Pineview Institute, he tells Doctor Edwards that he was not close to his father, adding that 'He was always at work', that his father had had a drinking problem, and that his parents had fought a bit, adding, 'My dad was gone a lot. I just mostly remember being with my mother' (4.6). When Norma visits, and Sam is discussed, she tells him that 'He was not a very nice man', adding, 'Your father's dead. He's dust. He's nothing' (4.5). She has also told Dylan about Sam's death, and we view a flashback to their argument on that day, where we witness his violence and her victimhood, accentuated by her 'victim's' pale, cheap clothes (1.6). In the same episode, Dylan discusses Sam's death with Norman, saying that he thinks Norma killed him, explaining, 'She hated him. She was miserable', and 'He was a bastard'. Soon after, when Dylan visits Norman at the Pineview Institute, he tells Norman that Sam was a really unhappy man, and that 'He could get really angry, and he was drunk a lot. [...]. He wasn't nice to Norma or me or you [...] made a career out of not being home' (4.6), while he also later tells Emma, 'He was a really bad guy. He used to beat the shit out of my mom all the time' (5.5).

Then, after her death, Norma gives Norman quite a speech about Sam: 'Your mother suffered [...] when you were little, and you were so scared, and your dad got violent, and your mom was so scared, over and over, and you were so afraid that you sent me out to handle things for you, things that you couldn't stand to feel because they were so painful and so scary and you were so little [...]. Your father was a bad and scary man. You wanted to protect her from him, but you couldn't'. All you

could do was watch, watch her get abused' (5.6). Then, referring to Sam Loomis, she adds, 'He's bad, Norman, like your father was', and later, 'He reminds me of your father, selfish, self-centred asshole'. In fact, Norman's father, the almost-invisible bogeyman, sets the tone for the entire storyline, in which a succession of men are killed off in an almost gratuitous portrayal of wish-fulfilment on the part of the producers. Later, when Norma tells Norman, 'Everyone I have ever known has sucked', and 'No-one's ever going to help us, Norman. No-one's ever helped us', she thereby references all her immediate family members and her deceased husband (1.1).

Regarding other fathers, there is a second invisible bogeyman in the shape of Norma and Caleb's father. Norma mentions to Norman how violent her father was (1.10), while Dylan tells Norma that Caleb has told him what her father 'did' to them (2.3). When Norma tells Norman about her mother's death (3.1), she is holding a hair ribbon which her mother had worn to her high school dance, and tells him that when her mother spoke about it was the only time she sounded happy. Norma adds that she had always hoped her mother would be that person again. When Dylan asked why she was so unhappy, Norma tells him that she 'just wasn't healthy', a euphemism which the script writers have seized upon as a pretence at subtlety, even though the cause of Norma's mother's misery, Norma's father, has been made clear on many other occasions. When discussing Caleb's arrival with Dylan, Norma tells him that he needs to put thoughts of his father behind him, and that Caleb had just come to get money from him (2.4), and when Dylan helps Caleb out when he has broken down at the roadside, Caleb reiterates the opinion that his and Norma's mother was 'crazy', and that their father was 'the most violent man I've ever known' (3.1). And lest we are tempted to believe, with the weight of numbers, that bad fathers only exist in the Bates universe, when Norman is on a blind double-date, his partner is telling the company how her father is 'a dick' because he discouraged her from being a stage actor (5.2). Then, there is Audrey Ellis Decody's statement to Norman that 'I was afraid to stay with Emma's father. He has a violent temper' (4.1), the occasion when Cody's father attacks her and Norman (2.6), and the matter of Bradley Martin's father committing adultery with Blaire Watson (1.9), compounded with Gil Turner's statement to Bradley Martin that her father had no loyalty (2.1).

As a reinforcement of the aspect of the Narrative which states that healthy monogamous and heterosexual relationships are as impossible as those between parents and children, general mistrust between couples is also evident, ideas neatly encapsulated in a comment by Bradley Martin when she tells Norman that reproduction is 'a really bad plan, whoever came up with it' (1.4). Of course, no relationship can be shown to last, besides Dylan and Emma's, which is briefly deposited as a 'mask' at the end of the series, in order to leave viewers with the impression that they have just passed through 37 hours of an apparently balanced set of relationships in the real world. Norman's passing through a few extremely brief and aimless liaisons with women - Bradley Martin, Blaire Watson, Cody, Emma, Madeleine Loomis, and, almost, Marian Samuels - is almost matched by his mother's list: Zak Shelby, George Heldens, James Finnigan, and Alex Romero, though there is also Taylor, a man she meets in a bar in 3.6. After telling him that she ran out on her wedding that day, thereby shooing in the 'Runaway Bride' (1999) message for good measure, she goes to his car with him to have sexual intercourse, but ends up spitting at him and running away instead. She also attempts flirting with Doctor Edwards when they first meet (4.1), to get her way regarding Norman's treatment, until he informs her that he is 'gay'. Her relationship with Zak Shelby, even if it had meant anything, becomes deceitful when he takes Keith Summers's belt from Norman's bedroom, and eventually leads to his trying to kill her and her sons (1.6). On a quieter note, her relationship with George Heldens is brief. As a divorcee, he mentions his ex-wife twice (2.3) (2.6). Since Norma runs away from his house while he is preparing dinner for them (2.8), then returns on a whim the same evening, imposing herself on him to extract sexual intercourse, then insults and dumps him without reason (2.9), we can deduce that his existence in the storyline is there to provide an example of shoddy treatment of men. This highlights the fact that whenever men are shown to treat women badly, it is done in order to demonise men, and when women are shown to treat men badly, it is done in order to denigrate men. Apologetics are provided for the women in these cases, as they are for Norma here, and for Bradley Martin in her poor treatment of Norman. We can deduce that Norma had never had any genuine feelings for George Heldens in the first place. And then there is

James Finnigan, whom Norma meets at the college (3.3), and who is also a divorcee. This ends in tears, too, when he is violently tortured because of his involvement with Norma and Norman (3.8), more aversion therapy by proxy for the male audience members.

Finally for Norma, there is Alex Romero, another divorcee, whom she cynically asks to marry her, to acquire medical insurance for Norman (4.1). Two episodes later, they are married, in a civil ceremony to which Norma does not bring a ring, and following which he moves into her house, but only for the sake of appearances, and she is evidently uncomfortable about this. When they are out for dinner, they discuss their past, failed relationships (4.3), in order to highlight and normalise such matters for us; relationships must be conveyed as failing in as many contexts as possible. He tells her that he divorced after six months, saying, 'I realised after about a week that I'd made a terrible mistake', adding that 'She left me'. Norma responds with a story which we might take to involve Caleb, saying, 'I did not have a great home life. My high school boyfriend knocked me up', practically implying that this sexual intercourse was non-consensual, adding that 'It was not good'. She then tells him that she had an affair with Sam while she was married, so Dylan's father left her, and says of Norman's father, 'He was an asshole'. She then asks Alex Romero, 'Who the hell do we sleep with?', as if this were an imperative, casual sexual intercourse having been pushed by Hollywood, as social engineering, almost since its inception. They end the evening on a feminist note, as she shouts, 'I'm keeping my name!'

They soon become closer, however, although Norma claims a real marriage would be too much for her. Things soon turn sour, though, after he speaks secretly to Dylan about having Norman more definitely committed to a mental health care institution, and Norma explodes when she hears of it, telling him that she will never trust him again (4.9). Norman complains about their marriage in therapy to Doctor Edwards, telling him that it is not real, that Alex Romero will think again when he sees how difficult and damaged Norma is, and that he will leave after she starts criticising him. Soon enough, Norma is telling Norman that he was right about Alex Romero, and that 'It's not going to work', though the scripted sympathy is elicited by providing the apologetic that she is, at least, very upset about their relationship ending. Regarding Alex Romero, there is also his recent ex-girlfriend, Rebecca, another partner for meaningless sexual intercourse, who is shown to have broken into his house intending to steal the key to Bob Paris's safety deposit box at the bank (4.3). Finding her there, he tells her apologetically that he got married, to which she replies, 'Don't be sorry. You're the one that got married; not me. I can still sleep with whoever I want to', thereby reeling out the old Hollywood narrative about what a prison marriage is. She throws his house key resentfully at him as she leaves.

Another fraught relationship we are shown is that of Madeleine Loomis and her husband, Sam Loomis, who is having an affair with Marian Samuels, though he has not told her that he is married. Madeleine Loomis is unhappy in this marriage, but does not know about her husband's affair, and tells Norman that she has been lonely because 'It's gotten really bad at home. It's like I'm living with a stranger' (5.3). The deception and resulting misery is all caused by the idiocy of Sam Loomis, with the two women, of course, as victimised as can be. Norman's idiocy, in not telling the two women as soon as he has met them and knows about the affair, is also left to linger on the air as another example of male heartlessness.

As mentioned, Dylan and Emma are provided as the exception with which to round off the series, but a dark cloud is introduced into their relationship, nevertheless, because of Norman's being implied in the murder of her mother, and because of which Dylan remains deceptive in their relationship for some time. When Emma finds out, she becomes cold towards Dylan and tells him that she cannot promise they will make it through this (5.9), although they finally do, leaving us with a happy-ever-after image of homely stability, behind which lies a mountain of dead bodies, and an even larger mountain of weaponised, leftist mendacity.

## Narrative 2: gender (Norman)

Norman is fatally, tragically and pathetically flawed. Being male, he represents part of the state of human masculinity as Hollywood would like to represent it (Type A), and this is front-and-centre in this Narrative, moreso than in most other Hollywood products. This extreme representation is camouflaged by the nature of most of the other male characters, which also serves to complete the Hollywood representation of masculinity; for the most part, they are also highly flawed, being immature, corrupt, and destructive (Type B), with the even rarer exceptions of Emma's father, and to some extent, Norman's brother, Dylan, being what we might call most normal, those we are most likely to encounter in the real world (Type C), acting as another layer of masks to cover that reprehensible majority, although the weight of numbers supersedes any lasting impression which might be left by these two. The purpose of portraying Norman, the everyman, in this light, is not only to denigrate men generally, but also, especially for those who are neither naturally inclined to behave, or will not be fooled into behaving, like Type B, to provide a model for young men to imitate, lowering standards for what they might aspire to. It is also contrived to get women to believe that this young man is typical, obviously not the kind of person they should like to have anything to do with, being a reiteration of the infinitely repeated message that there is nothing positive which might come of a normal relationship with any man, just in case they might be contemplating a relationship with any man who does not appear to be of Type B. Despite this, however, there is a long list of women who are shown to be sexually or romantically enamoured of Norman, presumably as a way of getting young men to believe the falsehood that women would be interested in them if they were like Norman. Although anything is possible, of course, on this point, it is more important to remember that we are dealing with a work of fiction.

From the outset, we are introduced to Norman as a young man (still of school age) isolated and dominated by women, with his other half quite literally being his mother, Norma. Bearing in mind that this Narrative usually takes a two-sided approach comprising the lionisation of one side and the demonisation of the other, it is no surprise, considering the premise of the original movie, to find Norman's fragility and social ineptness compared with the usual or exaggerated influence of the female characters, including the wide-ranging dominance of his mother, to provide an extreme example of this dichotomy. This sets up the dynamic conceived in both the original movie and this series, whereby the jealousy of Norman's mother, of her son in relation to other women, serves as the catalyst for attacks on anyone, especially women, who threaten their Oedipal relationship of inseparability and his complete dependence on her. This aligns easily with the Narrative of the flawed, incompetent, immature, cowardly, feeble, and emasculated male, and we are immediately introduced to Norman as such a weakling (1.1), witnessing his clumsiness, for instance, when moving Keith Summers's corpse with Norma, at which she complains, and his confession to a lack of physical prowess and independence, telling Blaire Watson, 'I don't really play any sports; my mom never really liked them'. At sixteen years old, he is shown to keep soft toys in his bedroom, and when he sneaks out of his first-floor bedroom in the evening, to attend a party with Bradley Martin, having been unable to stand up to his mother regarding his right to go out, does so clumsily, falling over after dropping to the ground below. Indeed, he has been shamed by Norma, and to some extent coerced by Bradley Martin and her nameless and brainless, everygirl acquaintances, into sneaking out to the party, at which he is shown to not fit in, and to be subjected to bullying by Bradley Martin's boyfriend.

### Norman: Cowardly

Because first impressions count, Norman's cowardice is also displayed on other occasions in that first episode. For example, in comparison to Norma's bravado at their first encounter with Keith Summers, Norman asks her, 'Do you think you should have said all that stuff to him?', followed by his panic, contrasted with his mother's self-control, just after she has killed Keith Summers. In fact, he wants to report the killing, deferring to law enforcement, unlike his brave and independent mother,



who gets her way in covering up the crime. This contrast is reiterated soon after, when his panic returns and he needs to be calmed by Norma, who comforts him and tells him, 'It's going to be ok'. Care is taken elsewhere to frequently reiterate Norman's cowardly nature. For instance, in relation to the police, again, when Norman tells Dylan about the killing of Keith Summers (1.4), he says he is scared all the time about getting caught, which resurfaces when Emma tells Norman she is going to the police about the Chinese sex slave journal (1.3); Norman asks her not to, and becomes terrified and furious at the idea. Similarly, when they are at Nick Ford's boat to look for the Chinese girl, and in contrast to Emma's bravado, he almost backs out, saying, 'We'll get arrested for breaking and entering' (1.5). Even more timidly, when walking in the forest with Norman, Emma points out a cabin where they could get warmer, to which Norman objects with the question, 'What if someone lives there?' (3.4). In this scene, we also witness Norman being scared enough of intimacy to run away from Emma, after they kiss inside the cabin. This is actually part of his general condition, as he suspects that he might end up trying to kill any woman he becomes close to, due to being taken over by his jealous Norma persona, but it nevertheless serves to portray him in a cowardly light, a device evidently favoured by the scriptwriters: when Emma is dropping him off at the motel and they kiss in the car (3.2); when Bradley Martin asks if he wants to leave town with her (3.9); when Madeleine Loomis and Norman kiss at her house (5.4); and when he rushes Marion Crane out of the motel before they become intimate and Norma takes him over (5.6).

More instances of Norman's cowardice occur when he tries to back out of the singing audition (2.2); when he is scared of the dog, Juno, at their first meeting, even though she is very small (1.7); when he tries to back out of sitting by the river with Cody because it might be cold, or rain (2.6); when he declines Cody's invitation to leave town with the shopping money from the theatre (2.5); and when he backs out of physically attacking Caleb, despite being egged on by Cody (2.4). This is all reinforced by Norma's reminders, such as after he has been held in the police department after accidentally killing Cody's father, when she tells him, 'Look at you, you must have been so scared' (2.7). Later on, she explains to him, in one of his hallucinations, that 'Your mother suffered [...] when you were little, and you were so scared, and your dad got violent [...] and you were so afraid that you sent me out to handle things for you, things that you couldn't stand to feel because they were so painful and so scary and you were so little', to which he replies, 'You've always been there with me, to keep me safe' (5.6). Despite this sympathy, she has told him, 'You've got to stand up for yourself in life. You can't let the world run over you' (2.1), while in the countryside, with which he is shown to be quite uncomfortable, especially compared to Cody, who is very much at ease, she tells him, 'You don't avoid things just 'cause you're scared of them' (2.5).

### Norman: Physically Inept

There is also a long list of occasions when Norman is shown to be physically inept. This involves his being controlled or bullied by others, or simply weak and frail, almost as if he were a rag doll, easily thrown here and there by just about anyone, and barely able to hold his insides together. For example, he faints in class (1.3), coughs when he tries to drink the whisky given to him by Dylan (1.4), vomits when Norma tells him that she likes Alex Romero (4.8), and also reacts to seeing the police remove one of his murdered victims from the water by vomiting (5.7). This is followed soon after by Norma slapping him in the face. Incidentally, he returns this slap, but regardless of the fact that this is all hallucinated, we are given to understand that he does not enjoy such rights to equality, even in his imagination, both because of her presumed privileged status as a female, and because he is simply Norman, of course, when she coldly says, 'I'm going to pretend that didn't happen'. On another occasion, Norma tells him he cannot go out because he could catch a cold (4.2), while he also has trouble changing a light bulb in Annika Johnson's motel room, with which she even has to help him (3.1), he fails in erecting a barrier of objects around the 'swimming pool' hole by the motel (3.8), and has a lot of difficulty in trying to get away from the chained and very weak Chinese girl, rather falling out of Zak Shelby's basement window (1.4). Then, when Norman is trying to support and move the Chinese girl, inside a motel room, he says to Emma, 'She's passed out again; can you help me?' (1.5), while, when he is later trying, with Emma, to move Dylan onto a bed in a motel

room, he is shown to be struggling with this much more than Emma is (2.4). These comparisons with Emma are all the more significant because of her severe lung condition. There is also an occasion when Norman is weak enough to need to be helped into bed by Emma and Dylan, which Emma manages despite coughing badly (3.6).

When Cody runs ahead of him in the countryside, Norman has trouble keeping up, and then when she tells him, 'just follow me' as she climbs up to her treehouse, the step breaks when he steps on it (2.5). She has to instruct him in dealing with this, and we hear him panting heavy panting when he finally reaches the top. When he tries to run from his imprisonment in the box, he soon falls over in the forest (2.9), a situation repeated when he is chased by Norma through the trees, and she tackles him to the ground (2.10), as Dylan also does (3.4), and we are reminded of those occasions when he stumbles and falls on the walk through the forest while Alex Romero has him at gunpoint (5,10). Also, despite attempting to save Emma from drowning in the river, we do not witness anything except good intentions, as she resurfaces and gets out of danger without his doing anything to actually help her (2.6). There is also the time when, after working so hard to reacquire Keith Summers's belt from Zak Shelby, it is Dylan who manfully throws it into the harbour, rather than Norman (1.6). As Norma tells him, regarding his father attacking her, 'You wanted to protect her from him, but you couldn't. All you could do was watch, watch her get abused' (5.6). Even though this refers to Norman when he was a small child, the characterisation aligns with the pattern.

There are more violent situations calculated to deride Norman for his feebleness, as when he is punched to the ground outside the school dance by Bradley Martin's boyfriend (1.10). Also, Norman is unsuccessful when he attacks Dylan, despite having the element of surprise on his side, and is easily beaten back by his brother (1.2). Similarly, when he attacks Keith Summers from behind, he does not manage to kill him; the job has to be finished off by Norma (1.1). Then, at the striptease bar, when Norman tries to come to the defence of Julian, wielding a screwdriver, he is again punched to the ground (4.4). And when he is breaking up the kitchen because he cannot face the thought that Norma has left him, he blames and attacks Dylan, forcing his brother to punch him to the ground yet again (4.5). Meanwhile, Norman is easily kidnapped at home by Nick Ford's men (2.8), a situation echoed when Norma knocks him unconscious and drags him to the basement, tying his hands and feet (3.10), and when Alex Romero breaks into the house to take him to the Pineview Institute by force (4.2). Finally, he is also unsuccessful when attacking Alex Romero with an axe (4.8). It should be mentioned that, despite his lack of physical prowess, Norman seems to manage very well against anybody as long as he is in his Norma persona and brandishing a large knife, which reflects better on the female character than on Norman, and these more extreme acts of violence are either not shown, or are shown, for the most part, being perpetrated by her. In this, it is being suggested that this latent tendency towards violence represents the real danger of which we should be wary, in Type A men, reinforced when Norman has a dream of killing Bradley Martin (1.9).

### Norman: Bullied

The instances of Norman's being bullied are just as ubiquitous, with the tone being set in the first minutes of the series, in the car on the way to their new home, when Norman tells Norma, 'I'm so happy you're making me move here. You're so smart to force me to do things I have no say in' (1.1). Even though he says this with a smile, the point is well made. But there are much more mundane, and less excusable, decisions which affect his day to day life, as when Norma, minutes later, has decided which bedroom will be his, saying, 'I put you down here, closer to me'. In this same episode, Norma speaks for Norman when Bradley Martin calls to ask Norman to go to the library, shaming him in front of her by saying that he cannot go, while he stands by in silence. This is such an obvious case of bullying that the writers seem compelled to address it, though this really just serves to draw more attention to it, main storyline premise notwithstanding, and when Norman complains to Norma about this, she brushes it off, saying, 'I knew you would say yes, and I knew that I would have to say no', and when they argue about Bradley Martin, she adds, 'I'm just looking out for you'. Norman is also spoken for by Dylan, who tells Norma, 'He's not living with you any more', about which Norma

soon bullies Norman in her turn. Later on, at a therapy session for Norman, Norma gives all the answers for him (1.8), and when the therapist, again very script-self-consciously, mentions her control, she simply explains that she is his mother, a common excuse which actually resonates in the real world, with an increasingly widespread trend of well-meaning parents damaging their children's prospects with micro-management, imprisonment, dictatorship, and general helicoptering, rather training them for their insignificant places as future slaves in a totalitarian state. In a later meeting with Doctor Edwards, Norman's therapist at the Pineview Institute, she tells him, 'Norman never went to camp' (4.3), which was evidently her decision. Other instances of Norma's domination arise, for instance, when she picks incessantly on his driving when he is learning to drive (2.1), and at the theatre audition when she explodes at him for walking out on her; when he responds angrily, she again tells him that she wants to protect him (2.2), which functions repeatedly as an apologetic for her behaviour. When she tries to warn him to stay away from Cody, this quickly turns into a demand, to which Norman acquiesces (2.5), and when he tells her later about his blackouts, she orders him to not talk about it, and to never ask her about it again, explaining that she is, as always, protecting him. Soon after this, when he tells her about his memory of killing Blaire Watson, she shouts at him to stop speaking (2.10). In her jealousy, she also warns him off Emma, telling him 'You can't sleep with her', giving the reason of Emma's illness, and adding, 'What you're doing is wrong, and it's stupid [...]. Just stop it Norman' (3.4). It is little wonder that he later complains to her that he does not like having no control over his life, and that she makes all the decisions (5.4).

When it comes to bullying from outsiders, we witness a second instance of Norman being bullied by Bradley Martin's boyfriend, when Norman is intimidated into leaving the hospital where her father is dying, having brought her flowers, and being prevented by the boyfriend from even seeing her (1.2). He is then bullied by Zak Shelby, who forces him, with additional pressure from Norma, to go fishing with him (1.4). Incidentally, it is worth noting that, each time that Norman is bullied or attacked by another man, both sides of the anti-male Narrative are simultaneously addressed, with men being portrayed as both the ridiculous victim and the aggressive oppressor, and it is not as if we are encouraged to have sympathy for Norman, either; no apologetics besides the appalling behaviour of the bullies are supplied. He is also subtly dominated by the innocuous Blaire Watson, who rather dictates the editing of a piece of his writing, in preparation for submission to a publication, something which Norman then asks her not to go ahead with, explaining that Norma would not like it (1.9). The domination of Cody is less subtle, calling him 'a quitter', and suggesting that he does not want to be in the theatre production without his mother, then suggesting that he join her in the backstage technical team for this production (2.3). When he does not attend this one day, she turns up to reprimand him, and ends up writing her phone number on his arm, which Emma tells him Norma is not going to like, and when he is furiously hammering a nail one day at the technical workshop, Cody orders him to 'Go easy!', and when he explains his domestic difficulties, uses this to ridicule him, saying, 'You actually love your mom, don't you' (2.4). She also coerces him into attacking Caleb (2.4), controls everything they do on the day they absent themselves from the workshop (2.5), and shames him into jumping into the cold river (2.6), so Norma was not wrong about her being a bad influence.

### Norman: Dependent

Notably, Norman's age is ideal for being able to portray him as an inconsequential young man, since he is also arguably, and conveniently, a child, as shown in the way he grumpily refuses to attend a yoga class at the Pineview Institute. His dependence on Norma is pointed out by Bradley Martin when she tells him, 'You try living on your own without any money, without any parents' (3.9). There is also a time when Emma, after Norman disagrees with her description of sex as magical, says that she thinks Norma does not want him to grow up (3.2). This is also clear in instances such as that when Norma chooses which clothes he will wear (1.7), when she tells him, 'You're a good boy' because he ran away when Blaire Watson tried to seduce him (2.1), when we see her making his bed (2.2), when she hugs him on his bed, his head positioned below hers (2.6) (as it also appears below Cody's (2.6)), when she is shown keeping watch over one of his recoveries by sitting in a

rocking chair at the end of his bed (2.10), and when she clears his taxidermy equipment out the basement without asking him (3.9). More dramatically, she is seen to shout at him and then physically pull him out of her car at the school, profoundly embarrassing him in front of his peers (3.1). At one point, Norma also tells Norman, in relation to his association with Cody, and as if his upbringing has nothing to do with it, that he is 'making immature choices' (2.6). In fact, Norman is normal in being quite aware of his dependence on his mother, when he tells her, after she has thwarted his attempt to take a driving test, 'I'm not a little boy, and you can't keep me locked up in our house for the rest of my life' (2.6).

It is also notable that Norman, even during the period even after he has learned to drive, often occupies the passenger seat in cars driven by women, and it seems that the writers have gone to some trouble to include so many instances of this. For example, on the many occasions when Norma is driving, including the trip to their new home (1.1), when he is taken to school on his first day by the Bradley Martin girls (1.1), picked up on the roadside by Blaire Watson (1.10), picked up by Emma to look for the Chinese girl in the forest (1.2) and at Keith Summers's boat (1.5), and when they go to a restaurant on a date (3.2) and for a picnic (3.4). Then there is the time when he goes into town with Annika Johnson (3.1), when he is driven around by Cody throughout Season 2, and when Madeleine Loomis picks him up to collect his missing car (5.5). Thus, Norman is characterised, from the outset, as something of a pet, a prisoner, a person without rights or autonomy, seeming to be deserving of Bradley Martin's ridicule, when she says, 'You are so cute. You actually thought we were going to go study' (1.1).

### Norman: Feminine

In considering the ways in which Norman is also emasculated by being portrayed as feminine, we should continue to bear in mind that he and Norma share a single identity, with Norma's persona, both while alive and following her death, managing to dominate, while Norman continuously struggles in vain to assert his own. It is also worth considering at this juncture the naming of Norman after his mother, and we are given the explanation, as Norma gives it to Alex Romero, in an obviously irrational statement which ignores the fact of the child's gender in relation to the said parent, that 'Boys take their fathers' names all the time' (1.1), meaning that his father has been insignificant in his life since his birth, and that he takes after his mother. Also, although these incidents may not be considered entirely feminine, they are, it must be acknowledged, more feminine, as they are generally perceived, than they are masculine: Norman is seen holding flowers on three occasions, once for Bradley Martin at the hospital where her father is dying (1.2), once for Norma when she is being released from jail (1.5), and once for Madeleine Loomis (5.4). The giving of flowers is, of course, something which men do, somewhat ritualistically, but to be seen or known to be admiring the beauty of flowers, or being associated with them in any way, presumably because they are delicate and pretty, consigns them to the realm of femininity, and even carrying them to a loved one confers something less than masculine on the carrier.

Then, Norman is seen crying at Blaire Watson's funeral (2.1), but the most significant incidents are the preparation of food and the dressing in women's clothes, both of which appear to be powerfully combined when he is shown wearing a kitchen apron while preparing food at home (2.7) (3.4). Again, while it is understood that preparing food at home is something which men do, probably as much as women do, there is a more traditional perception which lingers on, especially in the majority of cultures, while the absurd and pointless apron compounds this. There is also a time when Norman brings breakfast to Bradley Martin at a motel room, an incident taken from the original movie. Furthermore, when Norman invites Dylan for dinner at home, in the final, episode, he is shown to be quite busy cooking in the kitchen. However, it must be pointed out that, despite these instances, for the rest of the time following Norma's death, we are shown, a number of times, how the kitchen, while under only Norman's auspices, becomes the dirtiest, most unorganised mess, illustrating that, as a man, he is quite unable to look after himself; in this kitchen, apparently, cake can, for once, be both had and eaten.

The combination of cooking with transvestitism arises when Dylan first witnesses Norman in their mother's persona, finding Norman cooking breakfast at night, wearing her bath robe (3.6), something which is foreshadowed when we see Norman alone, taking one of Norma's dresses from her wardrobe and hugging it ecstatically (3.5), while this incident is allowed to stand for their Oedipal relationship and shared identity, as well. Later on, we see Norman taking the deceased Audrey Ellis Decody Ellis Decody's coat out of her suitcase and putting it on (4.9), as well as his attendance at The White Horse Bar, dressed as Norma (5.5). Incidentally, Norman's comment to his lawyer that 'Everyone has multiple personalities' is also of interest (5.9). It might be speculated that this is another nod to 'diversity', an unobtrusive insinuation that who we think we are may not be completely who we are, and while it is not a main Narrative in 'Bates Motel', the promotion of degeneracy has nevertheless long been part of the Agenda, and opportunities are often taken to at least mention it, however briefly. This contention is supported, for instance, when Norman calls the WH Bar to ask if Norma, being himself wearing her clothes, was with a man the night before (5.5). When the barman says 'probably', we are being invited to consider that such behaviour is normal or acceptable; even if this is only the case for a minority of people like Norman, the blithe manner in which the barman says this becomes our own cue. Dylan is a witness to this aspect of Norman's mental illness again, when he turns up at the house and spies Norma's shoes on the floor, which Norman has apparently been wearing (5.7). Norman is also considered less than male by Bradley Martin, when she says she likes him because he doesn't push her (1.4), which reminds us how none of his many sexual encounters are initiated by him. Norma also intimates her opinion when she scolds him for being moody with her, saying, 'It's not masculine or attractive'. Finally, when Norman is trapped and hallucinating inside the box, he imagines Norma telling him that it is o.k. because 'Everybody's mother lives inside them' (2.9), rather making the point that all men are like Norman; all as feminine as he is.

### Norman: Socially Inept

Social ineptness is another side to Norman's character; needless to say, he does not fit in, and this is most apparent in his juxtaposition with his peers. As Bradley Martin tells him early on, 'You're different [...]. You're kind of weird' (1.1) [Thanks for clearing that up for us, Bradley], while Emma overhears some girls badmouthing Norman at school, saying 'He's the definition of socially challenged', and 'He can't actually think he has a shot with her [Bradley Martin]'. Following Emma's defence of him, Bradley Martin is mortified that other students have heard that she had sex with him, telling him that 'It shouldn't have happened' (1.8), just as she had told him that she 'should not have done it with someone like him'. Also, when Norma talks to Norman about school one day, she says that he has to 'try to fit in' (1.8), even though she has always worked hard to prevent him from being able to. Indeed, when Norman is shown to be extremely apprehensive about returning to school after his kidnapping, Norma tells him he can study at home instead (3.1). We also witness Norman having a lot of difficulty leaving Bradley Martin a message on her phone (1.5), and when he introduces her to Dylan, his brother determines to take her away from Norman (1.7), just as he also ends up doing with Emma. And on one of the occasions when Norma warns Norman away from Bradley Martin, he tells her that he really likes Bradley Martin, and accuses her of trying to pick out his girlfriends (1.7). And then there is Cody, ostensibly Norman's friend, but actually, as we have seen, a device for showing only more disrespect towards him. When Norman tells her, after the beach party, that her boyfriend might be 'gay', she tells him that the boy she was kissing was not her boyfriend, rhetorically deriding Norman by asking him, 'Haven't you ever been to a party before?', and then, after accusing Norman of being 'gay', explains her behaviour by saying 'There's always a reason to make out, Norman', adding, 'You don't have to take everything so seriously' (2.3). Also, besides Emma's belittling comment, 'You know what's peculiar?: a seventeen year-old boy using the word "peculiar"' (1.2), and there is more from Norma, who tells Norman that his taxidermy hobby is 'not normal', complains that he does not do normal things, and ends up calling him 'weird' (2.1). She adds that it 'makes me feel like a bad mother', possibly her greatest insight of

the series. Finally, after she finds Norman spying on Annika Johnson in her room, she tells him 'It's not normal' (3.1).

Certainly, we would agree that Norman is not 'normal'. For example, we would regard his taxidermy, which he excels at, as an introverted pastime which, in his case, is evidence of a morbid concern with death, and a contributing factor in our appraisal of his mental health, and, as mentioned, Norma even prompts us to think this. But it is not only his social ineptitude and other indispositions which make him abnormal; it is primarily because of his alternating persona, which, coupled with his damaging, Oedipal relationship with Norma, as well as his blackouts, turn him into a psychopathically violent killer, in a rendition of a popular notion of schizophrenia. Notable here is that we are encouraged to read his domestic background as being merely an augmenting agent, with his schizophrenia and murderous impulses being congenital, presumably latent, suppressed traits. This allows the Narrative to pontificate about the fiction of unavoidable and incurable psychological weaknesses in men, as if to suggest that men, especially (and ironically) 'WE' men, are thus generally unstable and psychopathically violent beneath a fragile and thinly veiled super-ego, leaving us with a choice: either their weakness is one of congenital psychopathology, or it is an inability to control the behaviour resulting from this, and certainly, Norman is a perfect subject, such weaknesses in him being manifold and extreme, and we are provided with a ringside seat from which to view this, through the perspectives of the first-hand witnesses, Emma ('Decody'), Dylan, Alex Romero, Caleb, and Chick Hogan, as well as in the dialogues between Norman and Norma themselves.

### Normal: Mentally Ill

Norman's mental health is also, for our greater edification, noticed by a wider community, since the school demands that Norman speaks to a school psychologist (1.8), although Norma circumvents this by taking Norman for only one meeting with an external therapist. Later, she agrees to undertake this more seriously when she maneuvers with Alex Romero to have Norman installed at the Pineview Institute and have therapy with Doctor Edwards, with whom it becomes established that, 'at some level', he wants help, which is evidently close to the mark because Norman storms out when confronted by this revelation (4.3). Indeed, the story is also about the development of Norman's burgeoning understanding of his condition, and his becoming increasingly conscious of his predicament, eventually leaving all pretensions to a normal life behind. As he remarks to Madeleine Loomis, 'it's hard to know what's real in any moment' (5.4).

There is also the odd circumstance of Norman having kept Keith Summers's belt as a souvenir of that killing (1.3), and when Norma asks him why he would do so, he has no answer, although there is clearly a connection between the violent rape of his mother, followed by her killing of the perpetrator, all of which is deeply meaningful to Norman as a nexus of both his Oedipal and violent impulses, with the Narrative angle apparently supporting a facile hypothesis whereby violence and sexual activity are dangerously conflated in men generally, while ignoring other contextual factors such as culture and circumstance, which can lead to this sometimes becoming true in the real world. At this point, Norma seems to appear as an early instance of hallucination, telling Norman that, with the belt, Zak Shelby could make them do things they do not want to, adding, 'just like your father did', and that their new predicament with Zak Shelby is all Norman's fault.

Initially, Norman kills his victims while completely in his Norma persona, as seen when he first tries to kill Caleb (2.4), though this later yields to some acknowledgement, on his part, of what has actually been happening, when he tells Norma about his hallucinations (3.1), and when he becomes conflicted over trying to killing Caleb again, much later (5.3). Indeed, he is finally able to become his real self, to control his hallucinations of Norma and to separate their identities within his personality, as we see when he kills Sam Loomis while completely in his Norman persona (5.6). As mentioned, the united Norman/Norma personality is metaphorically and powerfully represented in the fact of their adjoining bedrooms, while he more surely loses the battle for dominance within himself, yielding

irrevocably to his Norma persona at the moment when he breaks down the door dividing the rooms (4.1). This allows the house itself to become a character in the story, as has already occurred in a dream of Norman's, when he imagined Norma's bedroom walls cracking and the room collapsing (3.2). Interestingly, although Norman remembers putting Audrey Ellis Decody in the freezer, since her body has disappeared, Norman and Norma both end up suspecting the other to have killed Audrey Ellis Decody, while the audience is also left unsure of this, allowing for the line between Norman and Norma's character to become more blurred (4.2).

Following Norma's death, Norman is seen at home calling out for her, then setting a place for her at the kitchen table, before getting into her bed (4.10). This looks like a more complete mental breakdown, with Norman's increasing inability to face reality. When he starts to realise that she is dead, he runs upstairs to get a gun and kill himself, but saves himself by imagining that he hears Norma playing the piano downstairs. Juno's barking accompanies this, and Norman finds the imagined Norma playing the music, in a tidied room with a perfectly decorated Christmas tree (4.10). Since this seems to work for him, he ends up disinterring her corpse as a way of saving himself, supporting himself in an ever more complete denial of his irreconcilable loss. He is also willing to violently defend this fabrication, as we see when both Caleb (5.2) and Dylan (5.7) are attacked when they intrude on the sanctuary of Norman's home, where he jealously preserves the last vestiges of his attachments to Norma, and the place he continues to imagine in an ideal state, right up until the end.

## Narrative 3: gender (men)

As mentioned, the other aspect of the Hollywood misrepresentation of men, as embodied in all of the other male characters for most of the time, is one of uselessness and irrationality, with a congenital tendency to be selfish, corrupt and violent. Practically all of the men are portrayed, predictably, negatively and seriously flawed, with the limited exceptions of Doctor Edwards and Emma's father, Will Decody. While these two are portrayed sympathetically, Will Decody's role is nevertheless muted, and also written out of the picture as soon and as quietly as possible. Meanwhile, he serves some purpose in the Narrative since he is a single parent, and we are invited to consider, since Emma's mother also seems to be such a reasonable character, why her parents separated. In this, we are invited to suspect her father of being more to blame than her mother, not least because Audrey Ellis Decody herself tells Norman, 'I was afraid to stay with Emma's father. He has a violent temper', and when she turns up at the hospital where Emma is having surgery, and Emma's father asks her to leave, she says 'You haven't changed' (4.1). As for her killing at Norman's hands, this raises a very significant point: it will be noticed that the female murder victims are all, without exception, shown to be undeserving of their deaths; only a few of them may have exhibited some merely bad behaviour or poor judgement, with Norma being the most offensive of these. On the other hand, all the male murder victims, except two, are shown to be deserving of their deaths; their behaviour is extremely destructive and damaging to others. The two exceptions are notable: Ethan and Doctor Edwards, who are NWE, and can thus be accorded the accolade of victimhood in the ongoing, leftist fantasy world. There is, almost inevitably, a 'mask', however, in the person of Marcus Young, another reprehensible male who is deserving of retribution, although he is a 'NWE' man. However, although corrupt and sociopathic, he has not been shown to harm anybody himself, and so almost qualifies as undeserving of his unnecessary and violent end at the hands of a 'WE' man, Alex Romero (3.6); according to the laws of the said fantasy world, the points have been made and scored.

Regarding the difficult case of Dylan, although he functions as a 'mask', usually doing the right thing, or doing the wrong thing for the right reasons, he nevertheless fits the general profile, the most important one being, at least initially, his interest in making lots of money with the least effort, regardless of the consequences to others. Another word for this is laziness, and another one is

shortsightedness, though there are many people in the real world who function with this attitude and believe that doing anything to avoid working honestly for a living is a pearl of wisdom which others are too dense to comprehend. This fact is exploited to invite us to consider that men, on the whole, are the ones most prone to this idleness; simply compare the amount of time which Emma gives to her work at the motel, compared with Norman, who is ostensibly the manager; compare the hard work of Norma, Blaire Watson, Jody Morgan, and Annika Johnson, for instance, to that of Zane Morgan, Jake Abernathy, Sam Loomis, and Bob Paris, and then consider honestly whether this is really a true reflection of the real world, and not simply of other Hollywood products. While Dylan does turn his priorities around, he is directly responsible for at least four killings, including the violent revenge on the nameless junkie who kills Ethan, and is implicated in others. Furthermore, he is shown to be not past threats and blackmail, as when Norma tells him he has to move out of the house; he threatens to implicate Norma in her husband's death by speaking to the insurance company (1.2). Being held up as contrasting heavily with Norman's character, Dylan is shown to have Type B male attributes, as when he recklessly risks his life to save Zane's from a drive-by shooting, and going on the attack (2.5). He is also contrasted with Norman regarding frivolous sex, when he seems to shame and bully his brother by telling him, 'I got laid when I was twelve' (1.4). As such, he still bears no comparison to any of the women characters, except perhaps Norma, who has that getoutofjailfree card in the shape of Norman's hallucinations; we have no idea whether she actually killed anyone besides Keith Summers, who was, of course, more than deserving of his fate. Bradley Martin, meanwhile, is the only other female shown to kill anyone, and her victim was Gil Turner, whose killing we also applaud.

### Men: Incapable

In portraying men as mentally deficient or incapable, we are presented first with Keith Summers (1.1), whom Norma describes as 'some pathetic, drunk, loser slob', and she is not wrong, because he lost the motel because he was unable to run it properly, and appears drunk and disheveled on Norma's doorstep in the daytime, threatening her before returning later to rape her, leading to his death at her hands, a scenario neatly encapsulating the core message of dangerous, useless male against victimised but powerful female. There are also Caleb's weaknesses, not least of which is his past crime of the incestuous relationship with Norma, but, despite his male traits of appearing always disheveled and being quick to use violence, he is sometimes shown as tearful or crying, as when Norma refuses to see him, then again when she relents, on which occasion he arrives with flowers (3.6). Being even more distraught on discovering that Norma is dead, he is also shown to hallucinate seeing her, a mental weakness thus not confined to Norman (5.3).

When Alex Romero asks Norma where his clothes are, it turns out that she has laundered them, and also bullies him to come to the house for her to attend to his wounds. When he objects, she mocks him for being contrary and stoic, saying, 'It's a little boring', and, 'O.k., Tough Guy, whatever' (2.5). As with her cooking and cleaning for Norman, we are shown that men are incapable of looking after themselves, let alone of anyone else; consider the mess of Cody Brennan's home with her father, about whom she tells Norman, 'I just wish he could be happy', as if parenting or domesticity is just too much for him (2.6). This is echoed in Norman's statement to Dylan in defence of his father, 'He was just unhappy. He didn't know how to deal with anything' (1.6). Such domestic ineptitude is to be compared with the order of Jody Morgan's home, or of Dylan's home in Seattle because Emma lives there. One scene which serves to promote an urban myth regarding men and women has Emma asking Dylan, at their home, 'Multi-tasking got the best of you?', even though he is merely boiling water while feeding their child (5.5). She tells him, 'You could have woken me up' (to help him), and then proceeds to mock him further by asking him to 'make an amazing lunch', to which he responds, good-naturedly, 'You might want to lower your expectations to just "edible"'. Being sympathetic to this lesser creature, and altogether the one in command, she tells him 'We're doing great. You're too hard on yourself. Everything's going to be o.k.'



Furthermore, when Norma runs away (3.5), the two brothers are at a loss: Norman starts smashing objects in the house, while Dylan can only think of calling Norma to tell her that Norman is 'losing it', and that he does not know what to do (3.6). Such incompetence is also apparent when Alex Romero irresponsibly gets drunk and calls Norma to come and collect him, which she does, and, presumably because he would not be able to manage this alone, also puts him to bed (3.7), and we might gather from this why, as he later admits to Norma, his first wife left him. Finally, when Norma finally sees that Madeleine Loomis looks like her, in asking Norman, 'Are you going to be one of those guys?' (5.2), there is an intimation, based on theories expounded by the great 'fraud' ('Freud') that many men marry women who remind them of their mothers, with a common interpretation of this being that they want to be looked after, as a way of avoiding maturing to adulthood.

Such psychological immaturity is also suggested in the case of Julian, a young inmate at the Pineview Institute who, as Doctor Edwards explains to Norman, escapes the hospital in the hope that he will be chased after, because it 'lets him believe someone cares', and that, although Doctor Edwards has been trying to help him for years, Julian will not let him (4.4). Incidentally, while this is also evident in the real world, we might notice that it is usually the result of ineffective parenting of boys, by which is meant the absence of a father. Meanwhile, men's psychological fallibility is also mentioned by Norman in relation to Alex Romero, when he tells Sheriff Jane Greene the falsehood that Alex Romero had no friends, and that he was a 'lonely, very unhappy man' (5.5). And male selfishness is also apparent, such as when Dylan refuses to 'be there for Norman' when Emma asks him to be (2.7), something about which Madeleine Loomis later scolds him at the courthouse (5.9), and although he is shown to be aware of Norma's destructive influence in Norman's life, retains a blind spot when it comes to his brother, even assuring Emma, who knows better, of course, up to the last minute, that Norman is not dangerous.

Men's incapability is also shown to affect their lives financially. The first instance of this is Keith Summers, but there is also the unnamed junkie who kills Ethan, and Sam Loomis, in debt, apparently, while his wife runs her own business successfully. In addition, we briefly meet the realtor, Matt: when Norma threatens to sue him for not fully informing her about the new bypass, he replies with a small description of his life intended to give us the impression that such conditions are normal for men: he is \$30,000 in debt, lives with his girlfriend, and his mother owns his car. We rather sympathise, therefore, with Norma's response, which is to hit him forcefully with her bag (1.9).

### Men: Violent

Of course, besides Norman, there are other men who are dangerous, psychopathic, and prone to deadly violence, which is a gross understatement considering the number of killings on all sides, but besides killing, it seems that any level of violence is the only way they can interact with others at times.

We see Alex Romero, for example, assault and threaten Dylan after pulling him over on the road (2.8), and violently assault two men in a bar who had threatened him because of the DEA removal of the Cannabis business. On another occasion, when he is leaving the motel, Norma tells him that she always felt safe with him there, implying that the world is really not safe, with the insinuation that this is because of dangerous men (3.2). In the same episode, at Dylan's cabin, a wandering dog turns up and fights Gunner's dog, so Caleb kills it, and the implication, when Chick Hogan turns up, is that this was his dog, though he denies this, making the incident quite anomalous, except in that it shows us Caleb's cruelty. Later, Caleb returns the visit to Chick Hogan, to make a point about keeping away from Dylan's cabin, and we find Chick Hogan in his shed with a lot of guns. When he is rude to Caleb, Caleb leaves with a menacing speech (3.2). Later, when Caleb is trying to chop down a tree, Chick Hogan turns up, with dead rabbits over his shoulder, and points a gun at him (3.5). Their relationship deteriorates even further after Caleb and Dylan have faced death when doing a gun-running job for him, and after Chick Hogan tries to kill Caleb over this, they fight, and

Chick Hogan is badly injured (3.9). Much later, when Chick Hogan accidentally finds Caleb in a bar, Caleb assaults him again and threatens him further (5.2).

Violence also occurs with Alex Romero, when he attacks the worker who fixed the furnace in Norma's house, and attacks Norman at Norma's funeral service (4.10). We also see him training with a punchbag while in prison (5.1). Other violence occurs briefly when Norman escapes the Pineview Institute with Julian. At the brothel, Norman is attacked by security staff, who are, predictably, male, 'WE' and shaven-headed (4.4). Furthermore, although Remo and Dylan become good friends, this is only cemented after they argue and fight in a bar (1.8). And then there is the occasion when Dylan tells Zane Morgan that he does not want to be a part of a mass killing at Nick Ford's warehouse, so Zane Morgan, apparently lacking in vocabulary, knocks him unconscious (2.7).

### Men: Hostile

It is apparent that hardly any breathing space for normal, lighthearted interaction is allowed in any Hollywood product these days, unless it is a device to set us up for the next onslaught of terror, violence and hostility; people are constantly shown to be in conflict with everyone else, even during their everyday interactions. The actual killings, as well as the actual violence, are surrounded, in addition, by a general air of menace and the threat of violence or, at the very least, open hostility, almost entirely because of the men. On one occasion, when Alex Romero wakes up in hospital after being shot, he is very rude to the doctor looking after him (3.6). He also leaves Marcus Young's body in his car in Bob Paris's driveway, as a way of communicating a threat (3.7), while Zane also dumps a body at Nick Ford's house (2.2), and Jake Abernathy puts Keith Summers's corpse in Norma's bed (1.8). When Alex Romero visits his father in prison, he is very aggressive towards him, ordering him to take Alex Romero's mother's name off the money-laundering ledger, while also telling him that he drove Alex Romero's mother to suicide. There is also the widespread sex business, catering of course for the dastardly men, and which, apparently necessarily, involves the murder of women like Annika Johnson, as well as the use of kidnapped and smuggled, younger women, such as the Chinese girls. In fact, the motel was the previous centre of operations for this in White Pine Bay, a joint venture between Jake Abernathy and Keith Summers, with the collusion of the town's authorities.

Threats, rather than reasonable requests and negotiation, are constantly arising, as in Jake Abernathy's dealings with Norma, for example, which are constantly menacing, as when he appears in her car and puts a gun to her neck, threatening to kill her sons as well (1.9), and when Norma meets Keith Summers's sister, Maggie, she has facial injuries inflicted by Jake Abernathy (1.10). Even when he has flowers delivered to Norma, this seems very menacing (1.9). This is similar to Nick Ford's warning to Norma, 'You be well' (2.6), and when Nick Ford speaks to Alex Romero about finding his daughter's killer, implies that he could become more violent (2.2). There is also an air of extreme menace when Zane Morgan asks Dylan to collect some weapons (2.4), since this could easily be a fatal mission. But since Dylan cannot live up to his expectations, Zane Morgan hires some goons to help out with the violence (2.7), which seems to forebode the end of his relationship with Dylan. Nick Ford then asks Dylan to kill Zane Morgan, threatening to kill his family if he does not do so, to which Dylan responds with a threat against Nick Ford's life if he harms Norma (2.8). Norma also receives this pressure from Nick Ford, her erstwhile helper, threatening to kill Norman if Dylan does not do what he asked him to. In the end, Dylan makes a heroic effort to help Nick Ford by finding and disclosing Zane Morgan's location, but he does not manage to kill him, to which Nick Ford's reaction is to try to kill Dylan (2.9), though it is Nick Ford who dies in the ensuing tussle. Later on, Chick Hogan threatens to disclose Norma's secrets if she does not tell him where Caleb is (4.6), and she is soon after screaming at him, in front of Alex Romero, to 'Go ahead and break the woman in half', as if hostility is all she might expect from any man. Later, Sam Loomis threatens Norman to keep quiet (5.2), and is generally threatening towards him whenever they meet, making sure that menace is constantly mingled with his romantic liaison. Then, Sheriff Jane Greene tells Norman that

Alex Romero might be coming for him, adding, 'Just so you know: he's armed' (5.5), which is realised when Alex Romero breaks into the police department threatening everyone with a gun and taking Norman and a lady hostage (5.9).

Unreasonably hostile behaviour also extends to the boys at Norman's school, and they are notable for two impressions, with Richard, Bradley Martin's boyfriend, rudely intimidating Norman at the party, and when he and a group of other males pass by Norman laughing at him as he vomits into a trash can at school, an incident which is, neatly enough, juxtaposed with the immediate arrival of a sympathetic female in the person of Emma. Richard is also intimidating at the hospital when Norman brings Bradley Martin flowers (1.2), and later, after threatening him again, punches him to the ground (1.10). Indeed, Bradley Martin is apparently unhappy being tied to Richard, since she tells Norman she is 'tired of being sad (1.4) adding, 'I just want to be happy' (1.3). [Good luck with that, Bradley].

### Men: Corrupt

Corruption features quite prominently in 'Bates Motel', not only in order to denigrate men, but also to characterise the nature of small towns in the USA as being controlled by corruption, as an endemic part of their culture, because they are populated mostly by 'WE' people. As such, this is a good example of how the race Narrative intersects with that of gender. Corruption, it will be agreed, is a bad thing, being unhealthy for economy and culture, as well as the individuals who are responsible for it, not to mention their victims, the entire community. It breeds only more dishonesty, more corruption, and perpetual misery. It is a common weakness, a symptom of great malaise and immaturity in society, perpetrated by infantile idiots connected to the power structure who think only of their individual, short-term monetary advantage, while telling themselves that this is the way of nature, or, more commonly, by those who are being threatened and blackmailed to participate in institutional corruption. With greed, seen when Alex Romero interrupts Zane Morgan's security man looting the safe after Zane has been killed (2.10), being the root cause, it would appear that this is inescapable as long as, according to Hollywood, we live in men's worlds like White Pine Bay. Besides Rebecca, who has used her bank job to launder Bob Paris's money, corruption is shown to be exclusively perpetrated by men. It is applied as if no other way of existing were possible; the whole town would disintegrate if the illegal trades of drugs and prostitution, as well as the corrupt people allowing them to continue, were removed; a self-interested, mass-collusion of congenitally and incurably short-sighted, greedy sociopaths.

We see, for instance, Bob Paris, a local businessman with control over local politics, attempting to control Alex Romero, the chief of police, throughout season 3. When Alex Romero asks him about the dead women associated with The Arcanum Club which he owns, he retorts that Alex Romero could lose his job at the upcoming sheriff election (3.3), while his selected replacement, Marcus Young, arrogantly introduces himself to Alex Romero as an inevitability in that respect. Bob Paris later tries to coerce Alex Romero, by recounting what he had heard about Norman from James Finnigan, to rejoin his team (3.8), one which Alex Romero had evidently been a part of. As he has already told Alex Romero, 'You've killed people for the good of this town' (3.5). And at the end, on Bob Paris's boat when he is trying to escape, before being killed by Alex Romero, he spells it out for us when he tells him, 'You're not reliable. you can change your name but you can't change who you are', and that Alex Romero has come to kill him for selfish reasons; that he has become his father.

Indeed, Alex Romero, ruthless and potentially violent, with criminal tendencies and a conscience, is chosen to be the main representative of corruption in White Pine Bay, as he is the one upon whom we rely to safeguard Norma and the town, and is shown to commit a number of different crimes, albeit often for good reasons, a complex character showcasing the very great skills of the scriptwriters. We see him alter the truth in his reports about both Zak Shelby's and Keith Summers's deaths to save his own reputation and peace of mind (1.7); besides other victims, savagely beat

Zane Morgan (2.5); steal Jake Abernathy's cash and keep it at his house (1.10), as well as Bob Paris's money (4.1); collude with Rebecca to conceal her laundering of the rest of Bob Paris's money, and to allow her to steal it from the bank; ask for Norman's polygraph test to be taken unofficially (2.9); kill, in addition to Marcus Young and Bob Paris, Zane Morgan, Jake Abernathy and Chick Hogan; fraudulently marry Norma to allow her to make use of his medical insurance (4.2); generally neglect to report a range of crimes committed in White Pine Bay over many years; and frame Kyle Miller for Blaire Watson's murder (2.2), though this is because he was otherwise deserving of the punishment, being a drug dealer and user. When Dylan tells Alex Romero that he does not want to be in the cannabis business any more, Alex Romero says, showing that he is part of a mafia-like operation, that he cannot, therefore, protect him (3.1). Incidentally, this unmistakable pattern of behaviour in Alex Romero is all contrasted briefly with Deputy Sheriff Patty Lin, who also happens to be a NWE woman. She is the one who checks Norman's DNA and discovers that Kyle Miller is innocent of the murder of Blaire Watson, is keen to prevent a miscarriage of justice, but is thwarted by Alex Romero who tells her she cannot tell anyone because she was not authorised to check the DNA sample (2.8). We also learn that Alex Romero's father was a police officer, and was also corrupt in this role (3.7), and this seems to be the pattern among the male members of the police department, since Zak Shelby is also a nasty character, imprisoning the kidnapped Chinese girl as a sex slave, and injecting her with heroin (1.1), as well as blackmailing Norma with the evidence that Norman may have killed Keith Summers (1.3) and removing evidence held at the police department relating to this.

Nick Ford's character also allows us to understand that the local businessmen are able to make ready use of the corruption of local officials, as when he uses his influence to delay the building of the bypass (2.5), as well as assist with Norma's being appointed as a local councillor; as the mayor tells her, 'You're in with all the right people'. Finally, there is the small matter of Norma losing out on being cast as the lead in the local musical because of nepotism (2.3) and, although the person who made this decision is a woman, we have another woman, Christine Heldens, showing solidarity with Norma, on this occasion, by quitting her position as the musical's director, although, of course, she is later shown, being a 'WE' woman, to be hypocritically prone to the same behaviour herself.

### Men: Sexual Misconduct

Another general area of denigration of men is that of sexual misconduct, which is also touted as a kind of congenital and incurable sickness, to be disproportionately understood as applying to all men. Even Norman is not immune, as he is shown to be susceptible to the non-apparent charms of Bradley Martin, as well as his own weakness for feminine beauty, to the point of distraction. After all, as this instinct relates to Norman, it is the premise of the entire 'Bates Motel' project; that this weakness in men, which we are being told is uncontrollable in all of them, is the overriding cause of murder and mayhem everywhere. We are shown Norman being distracted, even stunned, when Annika Johnson turns up (3.1), as well as by Emma, Blaire Watson, Cody Brennan, Madeleine Loomis and Marion Crane, while he is even reduced to spying on both Annika Johnson and Marion Crane, as per the original movie, as well as on Sam Loomis with Marion Crane (5.1). Indeed, Norman is even categorised as a sexual predator along with all other men when Emma's father preemptively asks him to 'Be decent' (1.4). Even when he is in his Norma persona, Norman is shown to be profligate. As the bartender of The White Horse Bar says to him, 'last night got a little crazy', after which we get flashbacks of him having sex in a car with another man, having been approached and caressed in the bathroom (5.5). There is also the matter of the local sex slave trade, which the hotel was used for by Jake Abernathy when it was owned by Keith Summers, made use of by Zak Shelby, and ignored by Alex Romero as sheriff, while Maggie tells us that Jake Abernathy operates another four such places nearby (1.10). There are also the prostitutes used by Bob Paris and at his parties at The Arcanum Club, and likewise the existence of the bar which Julian and Norman visit. And there is a moment when, while sitting beside Cody at the beach party, the boy she is kissing while ignoring Norman altogether, caresses Norman's leg; evidently, kissing Cody, being with one

woman, is not enough to satisfy the implacable male desire. For the sake of the overall recipe, however, such perversity is otherwise absent.

Then we have James Finnigan, who admits to being attracted to Norma despite his informally functioning as her therapist, which serves to curb his effectiveness in this quest, a clear message to all women cooperating with any men in any professional capacity (3.5). There is also the infantile Julian from the Pineview Institute, whose only idea of a good time is to visit the brothel/stripper bar (4.4), in order to attend to the narrative which criminalises male objectification of women in any way, while also pretending that this is a one-dimensional issue applicable to all men; somewhere along the way, the viewer is removed from their awareness that human society, in which men have meaningfully coexisted with wives, sisters, mothers and daughters, has continued to thrive for millennia. This topic would not be completely covered, however, without highlighting the absence of marital fidelity, in which, of course, the woman is usually the victim; if she is the offender, however, this is done in order to empower the wife and to denigrate and emasculate the man, the suggestion always being that he is unsatisfactory as a husband. In 'Bates Motel', marital infidelity is downplayed, with the emphasis being more on divorce itself, although there is the little-mentioned affair between Jerry Martin and the unmarried Blaire Watson, and the explosive matter of Sam Loomis, the husband of Madeleine Loomis, and his affair with the unmarried Marion Crane. Incidentally, Sam Loomis is also in debt, and we will remember Keith Summers, and the unnamed junkie who killed Ethan, and Matt the deceptive realtor, in this regard. Great care is taken to show Madeleine Loomis to be as much the victim of Sam Loomis's philandering as is his wife, primarily because he has not told her that he is married, but also because she risks everything to be with him and to pay off his debt.

Regarding male idiocy, there are also the inattentive male drivers: one who accidentally kills Juno, and the other being Chick Hogan, who accidentally kills Caleb; as in the business world, apparently, fatal accidents can only happen when men are at the wheel. There is also the incident when Norma is intentionally driven off the road by Clay DuFont (3.5). Remo also tells Dylan that Zane Morgan had been incarcerated because of his stupidity, speeding while driving a shipment of Cannabis (2.2), while another instance of reckless driving occurs when Nick Ford's men attempt their drive-by shooting of Zane Morgan (2.5).

Finally, although Dylan survives the carnage, he is a dying breed, being out-bred, as well as outperformed, by females; their child is female, which aligns with the 'progressive' fantasy that men are or could be a minority, if not extinguished forever, and it is significant, since the series is really the story of Norman, without doubt the main character, that there is no epitaph on his gravestone, signifying that the fantasy extends to the point that, having achieved the nirvana of the extinction of 'WE' men, they will thereafter remain unremarked, unnamed and unremembered.

## Narrative 4: gender (women)

Norman's lack of masculine traits, and the brutal and destructive traits of the other male roles, are contrasted with those of all the females, who are, as usual, practically without fault, being heroic, honest, strong, clever, and generally skilled, as well as being caring, kind, and productive. The line-up of lionised women in 'Bates Motel' are: Norma, Emma, Bradley Martin, Cody Brennan, Blaire Watson, Madeleine Loomis, Marian Samuels, Sheriff Jane Greene, and Jody Morgan, with lesser such roles assigned to the DEA head officer, George Heldens's sister, Annika Johnson, Lindsay Davis, lawyer Julia Ramos, Detective Chambers, and Deputy Sheriff Patty Lin. On the other side of this coin, providing the mask to add some plausibility and depth to the Narrative, there are those women who can be categorised as victimised-only, these being: Maggie, the Chinese girl, and Audrey Ellis Decody.

## Women: Strong

Since the intention is to create a world which is reasonably recognisable, there are no science fiction or fantastical elements, so the portrayal of women as physically strong, as well as brave, is achieved without the use of super powers or incredible technology. One way this is done is through the absence of such traits in men. The building of a new cabin for Dylan, by Caleb, which might qualify as requiring some physical strength, is hardly featured, and provides a reason to keep Caleb in the frame, while also putting him in danger when he falls (3.4). In terms of women fighting or trying to cause injury, this is limited to one killing each by Norma and Bradley Martin, with any other violence against other people being perpetrated only by Norma, and justifiably, as when she cannot find Norman, and attacks Dylan when he tells her that Bradley Martin is taking Norman away from her (1.4). Care is taken to apologise or provide good reason for her outbursts, which are minor and largely inoffensive, anyway, with the killing of Keith Summers being due to outrage and self defence. Part of the reason for allowing Norma to do this is to make sure that we receive the message that women are at least as physically formidable as men, with Marion Crane wrecking Sam Loomis's car, as a more than justifiable act, being a major example of this (5.6), and followed by the mild action of Madeleine Loomis, to bring us back to earth, throwing a drink in his face.

Norma's physical prowess is evidenced when she is moving Keith Summers's dead body with Norman (1.1), and helping the drunk Alex Romero get to bed (3.7), when she tackles Norman to the ground in the forest (2.10), and when she scales the wall of The Arcanum Club in her dress (3.2), following which she stops off and attempts to smash up part of the building site for the new bypass. Her bravery is evident when she goes to Jake Abernathy's room and asks him to leave the motel forever (1.8), and later goes out to meet him in an isolated place with a bag of non-money to give him, after he has threatened her (1.10). Finally, there are Norman's blackouts, when we see Norma committing bloody murder, which is an ideal situation because, while we see Norma as having the physical strength for these acts, as in Norman's memory of Jim Blackwell's killing (5.1), she is not guilty of any wrongdoing in reality; she does the deed and Norman gets the blame. Her heroics also extend to breaking down the bathroom door to save Norman from drowning (3.3).

Emma is another excellent character designed to display physical fortitude, since she lives for most of the time as a chronic, cystic fibrosis sufferer, yet can outperform Norman, at least, in hiking (1.2) and other physical exertion, as when she helps Norman put Dylan to bed (2.4), and helps Dylan put Norman to bed (3.6), while coughing badly (3.6). Her malady is also a chance to illustrate how brave and heroic she is, considering her restrictions and the supposed inevitability of her looming death. This is highlighted when Dylan finds her by the cabin, contemplating refusing to have the operation which will save her life, to which Dylan responds by telling her how brave and wise she is, saying, 'You're a freaking warrior' (3.10). Saving a woman's life, in this series, is thus portrayed to be infinitely more important than the deaths of any of the men, who make up the vast majority of the casualties, whose passing prompts not a word of surprise or regret. Other bravery is evident during her sleuthing, as when she takes Norman to Keith Summers's boat to look for the Chinese girl, with the intention that her attitude is heavily contrasted with that of Norman; in response to his desire to retreat once they reach the boat, she alone proceeds to break the door lock and enter (1.5).

Meanwhile, there is Cody, who is quite physical anyway. She is happily volunteering as a theatre technician, in which she convinces Norman to join her, is shown to climb easily through her bedroom window (2.3), in contrast to Norman's efforts with his, easily leads the way hiking in the countryside, leaving Norman quite far behind; 'just follow me', she says, and climbs up to her treehouse with no effort, even helping Norman to climb up when he is unable to manage this alone (2.5). Her boldness is also symbolised by her having tattoos, and evidenced in her plan to hitch-hike to Mexico (2.5), in accompanying Norman to physically attack Caleb (2.4), as well as in living with her violent father, which is a cause of her telling Norman, 'I'm nearly 18: I can leave soon' (2.5). Indeed, Norman even tells her that he feels safe with her, after she tells him, 'You don't avoid things just 'cause you're scared of them'.

## Women: Skilled and Brave

Female wisdom and cleverness is most apparent of all in the character of Emma, while this is mostly juxtaposed with that of Norman. In the beginning, we see her explaining to a floundering Norman what their homework, the tiger poem, means, and thereafter, when Norman makes up a story about falling on the stairs, she says 'It's ok, you don't have to tell me (1.2). She is also the one who uses her 'decody' skills to decipher all the clues relating to the kidnapped Chinese girls, while Norman just seems to tag along, contributing nothing, and she is also the one who works out how to break into Keith Summers's boat. Then, after Norman scolds Gunner and Cody about endangering their lives in the river, he has to ask her whether he overreacted, to which she sensibly responds, 'You seemed upset' (2.6). Later, after Norman has selfishly tried to ruin Dylan's relationship with Norma, Emma tells him, 'We all whitewash our parents' sins because, on some level, we need to', then asks him sympathetically whether he had really needed to tell Norma (3.5). On the same topic, she has explained to Norman about Caleb and Dylan, that 'It's his father', which Norman thinks a wise and succinct enough phrase to use later to explain the same to Norma, which seems to work well. In the final episode, while Dylan is still quite blind to how dangerous Norman can be, Emma is warning him to be careful, and even to call the sheriff, because she has worked out that Norman is actually dangerous (5.10). Finally, Norma also declares herself to be clever when she tells Norman, 'I know you better than you know yourself', although this is one of his hallucinated conversations (5.1). This is nevertheless in line with much else we know about her, as we consider other skills and talents evidenced by the female characters, which often intersects with their creative abilities and prodigious sensitivity.

Being the main character, it is imperative to showcase the most positive female attributes through the Norma character. At the beginning, she is the one who lets the sunshine into the rooms of the new house as she throws open the drapes, moving sprightly about, dressed for a summer's day in near-white, as Norman drags behind in his drab browns and greys (1.1). She also dictates how the exploration of the new home proceeds, physically steering Norman around and choosing which bedroom will be his; again, he is shown to have no will or imagination of his own. This is practically an archetypal image of enlightenment through the feminine principle, and although its poetry can be appreciated as such, as with the Isis statue in New York City harbour, unfortunately, the intention in this case is, instead, that we conflate females themselves with the feminine principle, and to see them alone as the agents of enlightenment. Norma is also shown being able to positively envisage the potential of the living space, while Norman cannot, the point being to show that women are much more creative than men, a point compounded by her remark to Alex Romero that 'It's a rare man that is [interested in design]' (1.1).

We are also very impressed by Norma's singing ability in her theatre audition, excellently performed without accompanying music (2.2). She also plays piano well (2.2) (3.7) (4.5), which also testifies to her ability to think and behave positively, regardless of her impossibly difficult life. We even hear her playing piano after her death, a hallucination of Norman's which saves him from killing himself, which ultimately means that Norma has saved his life again, even from beyond the grave (4.10). Care is taken to include a range of talents in Norma, the most prolific being cooking. She is often shown in the kitchen, effortlessly producing perfect meals, such as breakfast (1.7) (3.4), wearing an immaculate apron, which receives special attention on the morning when Norman is going to take his polygraph test (2.10). In the same episode, she and Norman have also shared some of her apple pie, which was on his list of things to experience for the final time before committing suicide, and there is the extensive dinner she prepares for six of them after inviting Caleb to join them (3.7). At one point, Dylan turns up at the house to find Norma busy making both jams and curtains, and when she initially has the idea for sewing these curtains, she talks to Alex Romero about planting fruit trees (4.7). Multi-tasking is in evidence again when she is shown to have dinner in the oven while cutting Norman's hair (4.1). There is also an occasion when she is preparing to make dinner for herself and Alex Romero, though he interrupts this by telling her they are going out for dinner,

apparently not a choice, and evidently also the incapable man's solution for dinner. In this same episode, Norma is also shown arranging flowers (4.3). When Norman first meets Madeleine Loomis, he tells her, concerning Norma, 'She was really very artistic and always wanted everything to be beautiful. I think it was her way of fighting what wasn't beautiful in the world' (5.1). George Heldens provides an equally effusive description when he tells her that she is competent, informed, and intelligent, adding, 'There's a depth and a presence and a force about you. It's so engaging', and, 'Norma Bates is a lovely, poised, confident woman [...]. You're the best part', while this scene provides no focus at all on his skills as a lawyer or presentation designer, which is the reason they are meeting (2.6). Also, as Norman has told Norma himself, while she is dancing with him at home, shortly before saving his life by preventing his suicide by physically tackling him on a run through the forest, she is 'the best mother in the world' (2.10).

Norma's capabilities are practically unlimited, in fact. As she tells Norman's first therapist, she never feels powerless (1.8). She is competently and immediately able to start a new and different life following her husband's death, taking on a business, as well as a new town, about neither of which she knows anything, and despite having been, apparently, severely abused in every way for many years, first by her brother, and then by her second husband. All of this conspires to paint her as being as much of a caricature as are the demonised men, with all of them straining our credulity throughout the series. Although her interpersonal skills can be very abrasive, her traumatic past and present are apologetics enough for this. For instance, we have her rudely scolding a roofer on the phone, hanging up on him and deciding against using his services (1.1), screaming at Caleb to leave the house, then ordering Dylan to never let him in (2.3), just as she screams at Dylan and Norman when they visit her in jail (1.5), then later scolding and threatening the realtor after telling him to market her house, but ending by attacking him with her bag (1.9). After instructing Norman in cleaning up after he has killed Jim Blackwell, she is also hits him after they argue in the car, even though this is one of Norman's hallucinations (5.7). When George Heldens turns up at the motel with flowers for her, she says he will never understand her, and shouts at him to leave (2.9). In this exchange, after which thankfully, he never sees her again, she insults him, as well as our intelligence, by telling him he has no troubles, which is another tiresome attempt to support the contention, touted as a religious belief by many, that 'WE' men enjoy unfair advantages in western societies, even though the opposite happens to be true. However, this is one of the obscenities provided as an apologetic for her outrageous behaviour, similar to when she calls the chairman of the council meeting 'a dick' because he asks her a question about her motion to abandon plans for the bypass (2.1). She is also disagreeable with a lawyer she visits with Norman, again deciding against using their services (1.5). Her attitude is summed up when she explains to Norman, 'And, you know that new bypass: they're not going to build it [...]. I'll think of something' (1.1), and, 'You've got to stand up for yourself in life. You can't let the world run over you', her determination then showing in her comment regarding their recent achievements, 'I'm not letting anyone take that away from us' (2.1).

Norma's boldness also shows in her decision, following Keith Summers's brutal attack on her, and her bloody murdering of him, to not call the police (1.1); her attempted promotion of the business locally (1.7); her proposal of marriage to Alex Romero, for insurance purposes, immediately followed by her decision to not have a physical relationship with him (4.1); her decision to end their relationship (4.10); her decision to move to Montreal, for which she has bought tickets for herself, Norman and Dylan, before even mentioning this to them (2.10); her commanding Dylan to kill Zane Morgan, to save Norman (2.9); and her demand to meet Bob Paris, a dangerous man, in order to blackmail him (3.5). When Alex Romero advises against this, she says this is because he thinks she cannot handle it because she is a woman and a mother, a clear scolding of the audience about any similar preconceptions they might also have. Her worldly qualifications are also announced, in comparison to the derisory potential of others, when Christine Heldens first advises her to apply for a council seat, saying the mayor would like more 'people like us' on the council, because the other locals are 'yokels'. We understand her to also mean 'WE' men by this comment, when she adds, 'I think it'd be great to have a smart single mom with a business on the board' (2.6).



Female skills also extend to being caring, and able to look after others, which effectively means looking after men. Even after breaking up with Alex Romero, for instance, Norma thinks about Norman's dinner, while on the edge of breaking down, heroically saying, 'Leftovers ok?' (4.9). Besides her frequent cooking, she also launders Alex Romero's clothes, then bullies him to come to house to attend to his wounds (2.5), also putting him to bed when he becomes drunk (3.7). We also see her organising Norman's life, as when he tells her not to forget his driving test, to which she responds, 'I'm not going to forget, when's the last time I forgot an appointment for you?' (2.6). She is also magnanimous, and takes some pity on Caleb despite what she believes about their childhood, inviting him for dinner (3.7), and then, when holding Chick Hogan at gunpoint on the bridge, being too humane, she cannot pull the trigger, and thereafter begs him not to kill Caleb (4.6). It is also telling that Emma also thinks of Norma as a surrogate mother (1.6).

While Emma does not display any specifically practical skills, she does have a lot of sensitivity, shown when she interprets the aforementioned tiger poem, telling Norman, 'It's about how could a God, who made all this beautiful stuff in the world, also make things that are scary and evil' (1.2), an oblique reference to the way we are supposed to think of men and women. Then, while they are in the forest, she shows a sensitivity to nature and the universe by expressing to Norman that they can feel they are connected to something larger than themselves, while Norman does not respond, and even disagrees with her when she describes sex as magical (3.2). Other talents and sensitivities in this vein arise with Madeleine Loomis, who runs her own store with a natural ability to present it beautifully, and who effortlessly bakes a cake while Norman is visiting (5.4). Bradley Martin's mother, whom we never meet, is shown to have rapidly and immaculately transformed her house following the death of her husband and the apparent suicide of her daughter (3.9), and Jody Morgan, while showing Dylan the areas where the plants are grown for her business, shows us that she has a lot of knowledge and passion for the creative side of it, when she tells him, 'I blend them, cross breed them. It's the part I love', and adds, 'I do like dirt - it's honest', telling us that she is honest, too. As an all-round wonder, her business and managerial acumen also allows her to know how to deal with her brother, asking Dylan to run things without letting Zane know (2.6). There is also the officious Deputy Lin, who is good enough at her job to have persisted and discovered that Norman probably killed Blaire Watson (2.7), and the forthright lawyer, Julia Ramos, who represents Norman (5.8), as well as Rebecca, able enough at her job to successfully launder Bob Paris's money for years (4.3). Finally, Norman's blind date is described by Madeleine Loomis as being 'amazing at designing websites', while the woman compliments her in turn, saying she's artistic and runs her own store, to which Sam Loomis responds by trying to rain on this parade, correcting her with 'our shop', adding that he doesn't have the patience to get through most movies, and that he's 'more of a doer' (5.2).

Being the brains behind the rescue of the Chinese girl, Emma also takes charge in order to achieve this, from the time she finds the girl's sketchbook in Norman's bedroom and asks to take it home (1.2), to deciding to make the searches, driving Norman to and leading him through to the forest (1.2) and to Keith Summers's boat (1.5), having called Norman to say she wants to solve the case (1.3). She is also the one to decide that they are going to attend the school dance, saying, 'No, we're doing this' after Norman has suggested, at the last minute, that they back out (1.10). Having been the driver, of course, after leaving the dance, Norman is left to walk home, proving so fateful for Blaire Watson when she then picks him up. As a motel employee, Emma is very much the responsible adult, and approaches Gunner to tell him to stop smoking in the room (1.9). She also makes the decision, when in the forest with Norman on their 'picnic', to enter the house they find, with Norman the follower (3.4), which is echoed in her decision to move to Seattle, since she is then followed by Dylan (4.4). She is also cruelly and righteously decisive in asking Caleb to leave Seattle after he has tracked them down, since his presence, according to a vague but presumably superior logic, would force Dylan to 'live a lie' with his daughter. Having been with them for less than a day at this point, it appears that Caleb's reappearance was contrived solely in order to show Emma making this decision, and without discussing it with Dylan (5.1), which clearly reflects what we are supposed to understand about both Caleb's and Dylan's subservient roles. When she tells Dylan, 'We're doing great. You're too hard on yourself. Everything's going to be o.k.', this is easily interpreted as the same power differential (5.5), which makes it especially hard on Dylan when she

later tells him that she 'can't promise they will make it through this', after it is revealed that Norman may have killed her mother (5.9), and is then shown to go through the motions of setting up and attending her mother's cremation alone. After this, being the boss, she tells Dylan, 'Let's not talk now', again as if he has no vote in that decision, after which, before returning to Seattle, we see her magnanimously visiting Norma's grave, and Norman in jail, at which point we see how she is the first outsider to discern, even more clearly than Dylan had, that Norman shares his personality with Norma.

Regarding Emma's caring side, despite being the one who almost drowned in the river, she asks Norman if he o.k. after his outburst in her defence (2.6). She is also shown watching over Norman while he is asleep (3.5), and offers to stay with Dylan and Norman when Dylan is worried about him after Norma's departure (3.6).

Although Bradley Martin has a much lesser role, besides very decisively killing Bob Paris, and getting her way with Dylan to access her father's office, she is also in charge whenever we see her with Norman. She first appears with four other female schoolmates, all socially secure in every way that Norman is shown not to be, and introduces herself to Norman with the presumptuous, power-playing imposition of removing his headphone from his ear (1.1). After their sexual encounter, she decides, without any challenge, that she does not want to talk to him at school (1.7). And later, during her brief return to White Pine Bay, after very decisively agreeing to fake her suicide and run away, she breaks in to her mother's house and steals a lot of cash. Since Norman is once again following along behind, she condescends to asking him if he would like to leave with her; it would be her show, of course (3.10).

Cody is a more forceful character, a match, in fact, for Norma, with whom she clashes over her influence on Norman. When she arrives to collect him, with raucous music playing loudly in her car, Norma tells her, 'I don't want my son drinking with you' (2.6). As a leader, she seems to easily convince Norman to join the theatre technicians (2.3), to attack Caleb (2.4), to take the day off in the countryside (2.5), and to repeat this so they can go swimming (2.6). Other instances of women's decisiveness and dominance include Blaire Watson, who first seems to bully Norman into trying out for the school track team (1.1), then into working with her to prepare his essay for publication (1.9). Then there is Christine Heldens, George Heldens's sister, who bullies Norma into attending a party with her, saying that she won't take no for an answer, and confidently telling Norma that Norma needs 'to get back out there' (2.4). She is also very forthright about dropping Norma like a hot brick, and having her removed from the council, after taking offence at Norma's treatment of her brother, whose keeper she seems to be (2.10). There is also Jody Morgan, revealed to be running the cannabis business (2.5), Special Agent Liz Babbitt, who is very authoritative with Alex Romero (3.9), and, for a moment, the redemption of Madeleine Loomis, when she scolds Dylan about Norman at the courthouse (5.9). It is also worth mentioning 'Jane Eyre', with whose work both Norma and Norman are shown to be familiar, in order to both highlight Norman's less than masculine virtue in being a reader of such writing, as well as to remind us that the history of ingenious and creative women, succeeding against the odds, is a long, virtuous and honourable one (1.1). Even Cody is shown to have a gentler side, rescuing Norman while in his fugue state after attacking Caleb, while she also nurses him following another of his blackouts after they hide from her violent father, after which she speaks to Emma about his blackouts, asking after Norman's welfare (2.6).

Other instances of caring arise when Madeleine Loomis phones Norman to say she will give him a lift to collect his car (5.5); when Jody Morgan has Dylan recuperate in her house, bringing him homemade medicine in bed, and telling him that she is making dinner (2.6); when Annika Johnson, although dying from a gunshot wound, drives to deliver the computer pen-drive to Norma, telling her to use it for her and Norman (3.3); and when Sheriff Jane Greene tells Dylan that her main concern in finding Alex Romero is protecting her clerk, Regina, saying, 'I'm going to do whatever it takes to get her back safe' (5.10).

Indeed, Sheriff Jane Greene, the new sheriff whose appearance (5.4) is clearly intended to contrast with Alex Romero, is shown to be as much in charge of White Pine Bay as he had been, although without any semblance of the once-indispensable violence and corruption. In her new role, she is, of course, responsible for managing others, including men, and there is a host of occasions when women are thus portrayed, allowing for traits such as decisiveness and confidence to reveal themselves, and while this might be said to be sometimes true of the men, the women's decisions tend to be more sensible, fair and successful than those of the men. In this respect, we might recall the businessmen, such as Zane Morgan, Bob Paris, Jake Abernathy, Nick Ford, Jody Morgan and GT, who, although brimming with arrogance, made foolish or impetuous decisions, putting them in conflict with others and leading to their demise. It might also be noted that, quite often, when a man and woman are together, as in all Hollywood products, it is the women who are given the leadership roles more often than the men, with apologetics presented if the roles are reversed.

### Women: Sexually Righteous

Women's dominance also extends to being both the controllers and the initiators of sexual contact with men, while this is never shown to be decided by the men, unless one includes the brutal rape of Norma by Keith Summers. While the message here is clearly that, while women alone should be the ones to decide this, men should not only be disallowed from expressing their sexual inclinations in the slightest, but also be nothing more than playthings for the women, practically the only use they are commonly put to, an obvious conclusion not only because of the behaviour the women exhibit, but also because any evidence that a woman might want to live her life with a man has been practically excluded from all Hollywood storylines. In fact, in yet another complete inversion of reality, we are thus given to understand that it is women who have the greater sexual appetite, thus perversely applying yet another male attribute to women, which rather puts a final nail in the coffin intended for all men; not only are they good for nothing, not to mention inferior and destructive, but they are also stripped of their remaining characteristics, rendering them invisible apart from the foregoing negative depictions, which confirms us in our knowledge that, even more than the lionisation of women themselves, this excoriating demonisation of men is a headline Narrative in this series. However, this is lightly masked, as mentioned, by the incidental use which women make of men, in attempting to satisfy their inexplicable libido, such that men are not specifically castigated directly in anyone's speech, except by frequent insinuation, while an apologetic is also applied to this idea in something which Annika Johnson says to Norman. While driving her sports car at speed, with Norman silent in the passenger seat, making the beautiful Annika Johnson another White Pine Bay everywoman, she explains her prostitution work to Norman, saying, 'It's just people, people's bodies [...]. It's just sex. Sex is sex. We all need it' (3.1), so that the designation is, momentarily, equally applied, which is as much concession regarding this role reversal as can be gleaned from the entire series.

Furthermore, in order to support the common trope that a man's sexual inclinations are a weakness, the men are generally shown to acquiesce to all and any sexual overtures the women exhibit, rather augmenting their aforementioned passivity, while the main exception to this is with Norman, who runs from most sexual situations because he is terrified that he will become murderously violent by yielding to his weakness, thus also making a strong link between sex and violence regarding men, as if this were the only way sex can be experienced by them, and the only way that men's sexuality should be perceived. This obscenity is broadly supported by Norma's being raped by her brother many times in her childhood, by the scene of her brutal rape by Keith Summers, and by Zak Shelby's imprisonment of the Chinese girl, which tells us everything we would want to know about Jake Abernathy's business, too. Mixing sex with violence, as well as an overpowering angst, when it comes to both Norman and Emma, is also a way of corrupting this natural inclination through a damaging overexposure, much in the way that pornography is weaponised. At the very least, the viewers of this series receive extremely mixed messages regarding sex. There is one mask cleverly provided as an understatement however, when Dylan is approached by a woman in a bar, saying to him, 'You look all alone', adding to the idea that it is a woman's place to make such overtures,

and that women are the ones with undiscerning sexual appetite (5.10). This is a needless, apparently innocuous incident, deliberately included although it has no bearing on the storyline at all, which expediently also helps to create the impression that things 'just happen' in a storyline; that they are not as contrived as we might otherwise suspect them to be.

Considering Norma's promiscuity, This first arises, at her instigation, with Zak Shelby. In this affair, she also tells him, 'you're awfully pretty', in order to emasculate him even further than his passive acquiescence already does (1.4). She also makes use of George Heldens, almost as a kind of revenge on Norman, the platonic lover she has just argued with. In this instance, she has already rudely rejected George Heldens, walking out of his house for no acceptable reason, but of course returns a short while later to find him there, still ready and pathetically willing (2.8). She next pushes herself on James Finnigan (3.6), and in the same episode, on Taylor, a complete stranger in a bar, although this is rather portrayed as the man's predatory nature more than it is hers, since she ends up 'escaping' his clutches at the last moment, and spitting at him in a disgust in which we are encouraged to join (3.6). She next flirts with Doctor Edwards, in an attempt to manipulate him for Norman's benefit, providing a more materialistic alternative to the female libido angle, which almost gives the game away regarding what is generally true in the real world. Then, in her carefully scripted dinner discussion with Alex Romero about her life, Norma tells him that she had an affair while married, then asks him, since they are now married purely for her own mercenary reasons, 'Who the hell do we sleep with?' (4.3), which chimes with Annika Johnson's apology for rampant promiscuity. Finally, when they do have sex, she concedes to not being sorry about it, but then tells him that it is too much for her, thereby making it thereafter a matter of her choice alone (4.4), while this slap in the face is masked by her cooking him breakfast.

Emma is less rapacious in her behaviour, but is still the instigator of intimacy, with Norman because he is Norman, and with others because she is physically fragile. When she first summons Norman to her home to discuss the sketchbook, she kisses him (1.2), while even the attempt to kiss him later scares him off (1.5). She turns her attention then to Gunner, inviting him to 'make bad choices' with her, kissing at the beach party (2.3), after which they wake up in bed together, although this is a false alarm. She then asks Norma, her surrogate mother, what sex is like, and is told 'It should be lovely', following which she decides to abandon her oxygen tank and asks Gunner to bed (2.5). However, she tries to return to Norman, and, while she does finally succeed in kissing him, their relationship is doomed by his running away again when she kisses him when dropping him off after their date (3.2), followed by her fury at his inability to lie down with her on the 'picnic' in the cabin (3.4). Finally, she concedes to sex with Dylan after deciding that she has waited long enough following her lung operation (4.8).

Although we do not see much of Cody, she is more pushy than Emma. After the beach party, she accuses Norman of being 'gay' after he commits the crime of assuming that the boy she had been kissing was her boyfriend, explaining that 'There's always a reason to make out, Norman. You don't have to take everything so seriously' (2.3). She later instigates sex with Norman in the treehouse, which is merely a whimsical and commonplace distraction for her (2.5). Bradley Martin is also whimsical in her invitation to Norman to visit her for sex (1.4) while soon after refusing him (1.7). We then see her in command of Gil Turner, whom she lulls into a false sense of intimacy before killing him; she might have just killed him, of course, but the moment is exploited in order to add another man to the list of libidinous suckers, as well as mixing sex with violence once again. Finally, Bradley Martin invites her own death at Norman's hands by initiating intimacy with him; although he immediately runs away, having hallucinated Norma watching them (3.9), he soon ends up killing her in the forest (3.10). Similarly, from the time that Blaire Watson puts her hand on his leg (1.1), she is doomed, although she impressively survives the entire first season before he kills her after she has taken him back to her home and behaved provocatively (1.10). We later have reason to suspect her of more widespread promiscuity when it is forensically established that the drug dealer, Kyle Miller, had also had sex with her close to the time of her death (2.2). Then, although Marion Crane is neither killed nor initiates intimacy with Norman, their sitting on the bed together (5.6) is reminiscent enough of other events to reiterate the link between sex and violence.

Dylan is also subject to objectification when sex is very presumptuously pushed on him by his boss, Jody Morgan, the point being made when she tells him, 'Don't take this personally' (2.6). Finally, we have Rebecca telling Alex Romero that he ought to be sorry for himself for getting married, saying, 'I can still sleep with whoever I want to' (4.3), from which we understand their relationship to have been very shallow. Indeed, division between the genders is encouraged in this portrayal, since she is in his house for the sole mercenary reason of stealing a key to Bob Paris's cash deposit box at the bank, while later absolutely betraying him to the DEA to save herself (4.9).

### Women: Victims

As well as their heroics and virtues, the women also need to be shown as victims, in accordance with liberalist-feminist doctrine, in order to justify rewarding them disproportionately; ill-conceived notions of historical subordination to men are given flesh and permanently preserved like miraculous saintesses, with the inventiveness exponentially extended into the present. The prosletysing of this ideology dictates that most of the depicted suffering of women in such Hollywood products is ultimately due to men's behaviour, an extreme example of this being that the women who are killed in this series are killed only by men. And, while the suffering of women is laboured, men are generally not allowed to be shown as suffering, merely symbolically and mutely sacrificed, with Norman's suffering covered by the usual rationale: he is murderously dangerous, male, and is congenitally unable to fend for himself. Besides this, Norman's suffering also helps to mask the extremity of this message, as does the division, as well as conflation, of female suffering into that which can be seen as being directly caused by men; and that which is part of her general disadvantage living in a man's world; the nebulous fiction of the patriarchy. Furthermore, the women are shown to have suffered, often through being victimised, their whole lives, which also lends credence to their heroicism and strength and depth of character, as do the depictions of them overcoming their oppression.

Norma's suffering is prodigious, and her life is depicted as having been generally difficult. As she reminds Norman from the outset, 'We've been through a lot' (1.1), which later becomes more insinuating, with blame being directed, we presume, at the men in her life that we have heard about. When she is unable to retrieve the carpet incriminatingly stained with Keith Summers's blood, she tells Norman, 'My whole life, I had to put up with things' (1.4), and, later, 'everybody always gets away with everything! It's not fair!' (1.6), as if indiscriminate retribution needs to be enacted against all men immediately. As Norman tells Madeleine Loomis, in describing his mother's desire to make things beautiful, 'I think it was her way of fighting what wasn't beautiful in the world, and things she just couldn't control' (5.1). Furthermore, Norma's lack of opportunity is contrasted with that of George Heldens, a successful lawyer, when she runs away from his house, which intimidates her because, as she explains, she is 'not educated or polished' (2.8), and when Chick Hogan suggests designing a new replacement window for her, to which her response is, 'I've never had someone create something for me before' (4.5).

More specifically, Norma's childhood is the source of her greatest suffering, in particular living as the daughter of a violent father, being raped for years by her brother, and then suffering violence at the hands of her second husband, and these three examples are reiterated as much as possible, with the presence of Caleb, as well as their presumed child, Dylan, being a constant reminder throughout the storyline. When she meets with a therapist, she avoids the question about her childhood and her parents, becoming very uncomfortable and resorting to lying (1.10), then later confides in Norman, telling him that her brother raped her from age 13, and mentioning her father's violence, though this remains unspecific. What their father 'did' to them is a phrase also cited by Dylan when he relates what Caleb has told him about his and Norma's childhood, while Norma responds by correcting him, telling him about Caleb's raping her. When Dylan shouts, in answering her, 'I don't believe you! [...]. You'd say anything to get your own way! [...]. He didn't rape you!', and 'You're a liar!', to Norma's evident distress (2.3), he is representing the idea that denying any unevicenced female claims of having been raped at some time in the past, is an injustice; that they

ought to be believed; somehow, the world is supposed to turn a blind eye not only to the extreme idiocy of this, but also to having their intelligence grossly insulted. Norma can no more prove her story, which may or may not be an exaggerated or false memory, than we could in the real world, and yet Caleb, who has a differing version of the story, compounded by Norma's self-contradiction in her denial that Dylan is Caleb's son, citing, instead, an unwanted pregnancy by a 'high school boyfriend', after telling Alex Romero, 'I did not have a great home life' (4.3), is repeatedly castigated as a serial-incestuous rapist.

Norma is also shown to suffer permanent trauma as a result of this experience, as when, after driving to the motel where Caleb is staying, she cannot bring herself to go through with meeting him (2.4), and is shown to believe that Caleb still represents a physical threat to her, also voiced by Norman when he tells her, 'I'll take good care of you'. In this same episode, as Dylan is packing to move, Norma tells him again that Caleb raped her, but again receives a cruel reply, 'Why did you have me, Norma?'. On another occasion, with the danger of the story of her past leaking out of the family unit, Norma shouts at Chick Hogan to 'Go ahead and 'break the woman in half', later explaining to Alex Romero, 'Our whole life was a torture. We were all we had' (4.6).

Norma is also subject to new threats, from Keith Summers, then Zak Shelby, then Jake Abernathy, who leaves Keith Summers's corpse in her bed, leaves her a menacing note with anonymously-delivered flowers, and ends up putting a gun to her neck, threatening to kill her sons as well as her (1.9). Meanwhile, she is again the victim of discrimination when she is not assigned the role in the theatre musical which she deserved, while the musical director, Christine Heldens, resigns over this, rallying to the cause, and then telling Norma how brave she is (2.3).

Other women have their tragedies, too, as we see with Blaire Watson, who mentions to Norman that she knows 'we're not meant to be happy'. Soon after, when he hints at the control Norma has over his life, she says she knows 'what it's like' for him (1.9), while in the next episode, Norman witnesses her on the phone with her father's business manager, becoming very upset (1.10). Emma, meanwhile, tells Norman 'I'm pretty used to things not turning out the way I expect, and making the best of it [...]. I don't have many real friends' (1.8), while our sympathy is further elicited by the effort she makes in dressing up for Norman (3.3). Regarding Madeleine Loomis, who obviously suffers because of her husband's affair with Marion Crane, when Norman first tells her about Norma's difficulties, mentioning 'things she just couldn't control', she replies, 'I totally understand that' (5.1), and later tells Norman how lonely she is, saying, 'It's gotten really bad at home. It's like I'm living with a stranger' (5.3). As for Marion Crane herself, she does not intentionally cause Madeleine Loomis's misery because Sam Loomis has not told her that he is married, and she has her own sob story, telling Sam, 'I never felt like I belonged anywhere', while also being belittled and held back by her male boss (5.5). She also tells Norman, 'My mom died when I was five [...]. My dad didn't want me [...]. When I was 15, I got a bus to Seattle, and I've been on my own ever since', and later, 'All my life, I played by the rules, been a good person, and where's it gotten me?' (5.6). She is also beset by other male offensiveness and prejudice, as if this facile, feminist perspective were a persistent reality in the world she is presumed to inhabit. This is applied forcefully with regard to her manager at her legal job, whom we are told by Sam Loomis is 'an ass' (5.5). Her boss scolds her for her punctuality and for her bad timing in relation to asking for a promotion or a raise, which he refuses to discuss. The client in his office also makes her feel bad by asking her to feel the weight of the case of money, then patronising her with his apology for her discomfort, saying, 'Sorry, Sweetheart'. Meanwhile, Bradley Martin, while not shown to be suffering particularly, is shown to be always miserable, with a hint that some of this might be due to her boyfriend. Real tragedy arrives when her father is killed, and after she leaves White Pine Bay, telling Norman upon her return, 'You try living on your own without any money, without any parents' (3.9).

More generally, this overall mood and narrative is supported by the story of the Chinese girls, kidnapped, trafficked, imprisoned and drugged by Jake Abernathy, then repeatedly raped by his clients, which echoes the use of prostitutes, who are sometimes murdered, at The Arcanum Club, and on the occasion when Julian takes Norman to a brothel, where women are again shown to be

objectified (4.4). There is also tragedy in the life of the minor character, Maggie, Keith Summers's unmarried sister, who suffers facial bruising at the hands of Jake Abernathy (1.10). She is the one who tells us that Jake Abernathy has been running the kidnapping business in four other places on the same coast. Finally, there is the overacted victimhood of Regina, the police department clerk, when she is taken by Alex Romero as a driver when he kidnaps Norman. This is a very minor part of the storyline, and might as easily have been omitted, begging the question of why it is included. Regina's trauma is shown to increase with every tense minute, even though nothing happens to her (5.9). This seems to serve the purpose of informing us that women are easily traumatised by men even without being physically harmed, and that threatening behaviour, which is to be subjectively ascertained, of course, might be judged as being as offensive as actual physical harm. It is a point clumsily made, running in contradiction to the lionisation narrative, which explains its muted role, but it is a point made nevertheless. This brief scenario also lets us know how precious Regina is, when Sheriff Jane Greene tells Dylan, who has come to complain about Norman being endangered by lax security at the police department, that her main concern is saving Regina (5.10). We are left to make up our own minds about whether Regina's gender is a factor in this prioritisation.

## Narrative 5: death

Death is both theme and Narrative, being both motif, partly due to its ubiquity in 'Bates Motel', as well as a programming tool. It is a major theme of this storyline, since it deals primarily with the development of Norman into a killer, and the presence of death in his life, as with his hobby of taxidermy, lifted from the original movie. The bottom line is that the importance of death in this series is impossible to avoid, and like many another Hollywood product, here it is almost hysterical in its prevalence; this is not happy viewing; it is dark in the extreme and its effect augmented by its often unbridled, graphic nature, all unthinkable to audiences of earlier generations, pushing the limits of our increased natural tolerance for consumption of such depravity and morbidity as entertainment in the name of storytelling. And one becomes nostalgic for movies like 'Psycho' or 'The Shining' (1980), for example, where, despite being ostensibly 'horror' movies, included only two and one in-story killing, respectively. The trick in most movies in those days, despite the early and controversial arrivals of 'Death Wish' (1974), and 'The Terminator' (1984), was always to make death, the fear or threat of it, a source for tension and dynamism to provide for character motive and viewer engagement, and this subsisted on the natural and active tendency of audiences to use their imaginations and instinctive empathy.

Despite the ongoing, engineered 'dumbing down' of humanity globally, it might be argued that people could not so rapidly have lost their innate ability to use their imagination to such an extent that depictions of everything need to be more extremely literal and graphic. This is beyond 'content creep' since it has developed too rapidly and excessively to merit that description; 'avalanche' seems more apt. So, why the increased reference to death, mainly due to unlawful killing, pervading Hollywood products? In answering this, we might first consider that, although the way this theme is managed allows the audience to be further pacified by leaving less to the imagination, stress and a heightened sense of fear is nevertheless induced, and augmented by the frequency of scenes involving killing. This has an effect on the audience's perception of reality as, to a greater or lesser degree, they come to perceive the real world and other people as increasingly dangerous or psychopathic. Although such a perception bears little resemblance to reality itself, and we seldom hear in the real world about the kind of depravity depicted on the screen, what is important here is not only the move in that general direction, but also the dehumanisation of the viewer, and the pessimism and fear engendered, contributing to increased incidences and severity of depression and anxiety, as well as divisions between people. In turn, this has its intended effect on an individual's immune system and interaction with others, adding to the prevalence of illness and disease, leading to ever-more negative expectations in the real world, and the increased likelihood of negative manifestation according to the Tarot effect.

The prevalence of this Narrative speaks of a cheapening and taking-for-granted of human life, with the intention that we become inured to the idea not only of death, but of premature death, and even killing, either gratuitous or purposeful. The sanctity of life and death, or sincere regret at the loss of a loved one, only ever manifests in Norman's sorrow at the deaths of Norma and Blaire Watson, though his weeping at the funeral of Blaire Watson (2.1) is a distracting instance of non-grief, since he barely knew her, and his distress is mainly due to a subconscious awareness that he had killed her. Also, during the funeral service for Norma, at which Norman is the only participant, he throws the mood entirely off course when he berates the priest, as if catering for life after death, or the preservation of life, is somehow a responsibility the priest has renounced. This, however, is only the start of the disruption of the service, the distraction from its supposed purpose, as Alex Romero then turns up and attacks Norman violently (4.10), the scene ending after shouting and punching among the pews.

It should be mentioned at this point that such effects are generally camouflaged, according to the FWO modus operandi, by providing for a range of possibilities for the cause of breakdowns in the health of society or individuals, and of which depraved viewing content is but one. Thus, it is made impossible to scientifically attribute any effect to a single cause, thus diluting or more easily discrediting claims of harm emanating from one source. The result of this is that, despite what we suspect or know to be true, nobody has the time or resources to investigate, far less satisfactorily prove, the causes of the ongoing regression of humanity on all fronts. In fact, this retardation is actually due to that multiplicity of engineered causes, while this modus operandi was evidently implemented for its efficacy and resilience to analysis.

Thus, while the original movie centred around a single in-story killing, with a second murder arising as a result of the first, this series covers approximately thirty significant killings. Besides this, there are other death incidences and presences, even beyond that of taxidermy. To be more scientific, if we compare the length of the original movie with that of this series, the number of killings in the latter would be approximately 36, a number which it does approximate, making them equivalent in their 'kill ratios'. However, in light of the foregoing discussion, we would more correctly consider these numbers as belonging to only two products: the movie and the series; an audience exposed to two killings compared with an audience exposed to over thirty killings. In fact, the amount of time dedicated to exposure to this depravity is, as mentioned, yet another factor contributing to the insidiousness of the intended effects, with the graphic nature of the killings another, and the repetition of killings yet another; compare this with the studied avoidance of such depiction in the one killing in the original movie. In this case, the resulting impression is that we are witnessing death and killing almost constantly, and that when we are not, we have been primed to anticipate it at any moment, which comes to the same thing. The impression certainly is that we have witnessed many more killings than the 'mere' thirty-plus. Despite the investment of considerable amounts of money, energy and professional skill in this series, one hesitates to call the artless, gratuitous nature of such depiction inspired, much less an achievement.

As with other themes, we should also consider that the normalisation of death and killing can also be cross-referenced with other Narratives. In this case, we should note, for instance, that familial estrangement is enhanced because of the murderous tendencies which members of the same family often have towards each other. In addition, care has been taken to ensure that only two killings are carried out by women, complete with apologetics, helping to demonise men as per the gender Narrative, which is further supported by the unethical behaviour of Alex Romero who, as sheriff, kills a number of people extra-judicially. As Bob Paris says to him (3.5), 'You've killed people for the good of this town'. Meanwhile, the race Narrative is supported by the absence of any killings perpetrated by 'NWE' people, and instances of an 'anti-gun' agenda, although less than overtly represented, is common enough to be noticeable, and easily covered by the death Narrative.

The pervasiveness of this theme includes suicide, matricide, fratricide, patricide, homicide, avunculicide, and probable matricide, with the most significant 30 killings as follows:



character killed	character's role	killer
Sam Bates	Norman's father	Norman or Norma
Blair Watson	Norman's school teacher	Norman
Alex Romero	local sheriff	Norman
Bradley Martin	Norman's schoolmate	Norman
Audrey Ellis Decody Ellis Decody	Emma's mother	Norman
Norma	Norman's mother	Norman
Jimmy Brennan	Cody's father	Norman
Jim Blackwell ( <i>via Norman</i> )	assassin hired to kill Norman	Norman
<i>man at The White Horse Bar</i>	acquaintance of Norman as Norma	Norman
Sam Loomis	Madeleine Loomis's husband	Norman
Doctor Edwards ('NWE')	Norman's doctor at Pineview	<i>unknown (Norman implicated)</i>
Caleb Calhoun	Dylan's father / Norma's brother	Chick Hogan ( <i>assisted by Norman</i> )
Keith Summers	former motel owner	Norma ( <i>assisted by Norman</i> )
Zak Shelby	Deputy Sheriff	Dylan ( <i>assisted by Norman</i> )
<i>unnamed junkie</i>	debtor of Gil Turner	Dylan
Nick Ford	cannabis business owner	Dylan
Norman	Norma's son	Dylan
Jake Abernathy	sex slave businessman	Alex Romero
Marcus Young ('NWE')	aspiring sheriff	Alex Romero
Bob Paris	President of The Arcanum Club	Alex Romero
Chick Hogan	local, eccentric gun-runner	Alex Romero
Zane Morgan	Jody Morgan's brother	Alex Romero
Annika Johnson	party sex worker	<i>unknown, via Bob Paris</i>
Lindsay Davis	party sex worker	<i>unknown, via Bob Paris</i>
Clay DuFont	employee of Bob Paris	<i>unknown, via Bob Paris</i>
Jerry Martin	Bradley Martin's father	Gil Turner
Gil Turner	cannabis business manager	Bradley Martin
Lee Berman	councillor	Nick Ford
Jody Morgan	cannabis business owner	Zane Morgan
Ethan Chang ('NWE')	Dylan's first work colleague	<i>unnamed junkie</i>

The death list is alternatively listed as 37 ([https://listofdeaths.fandom.com/wiki/Bates\\_Motel](https://listofdeaths.fandom.com/wiki/Bates_Motel)) and as 48 ([https://batesmotel.fandom.com/wiki/Deaths\\_on\\_Bates\\_Motel](https://batesmotel.fandom.com/wiki/Deaths_on_Bates_Motel)), depending on which other

aspects of this theme's presence are considered. For instance, there are the deaths of two dogs (1.7) (3.2), alongside the proliferation of roadkill and animals killed by Chick Hogan, which support Norman's taxidermy hobby, as seen when Chick Hogan arrives at the motel with a dead racoon (5.8). This hobby helps to ensure that death images are included in more scenes than they would be otherwise, being a part of the decor of the Bates house, as well as a feature in The Arcanum Club, and of Emma's house, since her father is a professional taxidermist.

Furthermore, the deaths are very much connected with the Bates family, adding an unsettling, domestic dimension to the now-common proliferation of gratuitous killings as exemplified by serieses such as ' Fargo' (2014 - ) or 'Preacher' (2016 - 2019). Therefore, in a more profound way than in those serieses, most of the deaths in 'Bates Motel' are enacted 'close to home', and the killings mostly of people we have been brought to know and even empathise with. The effect of this can be more striking or traumatic than the other killings depicted, as well as intersecting easily with the familial estrangement Narrative, and thereby enhancing the intended effects of both Narratives; the violence is more shocking for being between family members, and the familial estrangement is more extreme for being thoroughly murderous, as when, for instance, Norman orders Dylan to 'stop meddling with the truth', then becomes Norma, and tries to kill him (5.7). In this striking scene, Norman proceeds to have a hallucinated fight with Norma, which, fortunately for Dylan, Norman wins. Inter-familial violence is also part of Norman's killing of Emma's mother who, following Emma's joining with Dylan, would mean that he killed his brother's sister-in-law. Further, when Dylan reveals this news to Emma, she threatens to separate from him despite their having a child together, telling him not to mention having sympathy for his brother, and adding that she might kill Norman (her brother-in-law) if she sees him (5.9). Then, there is Norman's attempted killing of Caleb, his uncle, with a knife (2.4), and the later discussion between Chick Hogan and Norma about their both wanting Caleb, her brother and her son's father, killed, and his suggestion that she should keep a knife handy (4.5). Following her death, and shortly before Caleb's own eventual and accidental demise at the hands of Chick Hogan and Norman, after his return to the house with the intention to kill his nephew, Norman, in his Norma persona, tells Caleb that Norman will probably have to kill him (5.3). Soon enough, Norman hallucinates Norma asking him to kill Caleb, and loading a gun for him, with the advice, 'Fast and true, right through the brain'. And in the final episode (5.10), Dylan joins Norman for dinner, which soon develops into an argument with Norman lunging at Dylan with a knife and Dylan shooting him dead. Almost as if to normalise the idea of such familial dysfunction and violence, we are also shown the literally murderous sibling rivalry between Zane and Jody Morgan, who have both planned to kill each other. In the event, he succeeds in killing her while she manages to cut him with a knife (2.10).

Regarding suicide, this is generally pushed as an option onto younger generations, who are more prone to depression and suggestion, as well as a greater need for self-validating attention. It is obliquely referenced by Norman's watching of 'Meet John Doe', in which, appropriately, a man impersonates a nonexistent person who says he will be committing suicide as a protest (2.9). In fact, the producers considered this reference significant enough to show that Norman had seen it enough times to have memorised its dialogue. Suicide is often even glorified or justified and younger people targeted, as seen in the serieses '13 Reasons Why' (2017 - ) and 'The OA' (2016 - 2019), for instance. In 'Bates Motel', besides the suicide of Alex Romero's mother outside the storyline, we have both Bradley Martin and Norman, as the two characters intended to influence young viewers most, the selected teenage role models for the choice of suicide, though both of them are ultimately killed by others, allowing for their deaths and potential deaths to be fully exploited. Firstly, Bradley Martin is intent on killing herself (2.1) after discovering her father's marital infidelity, but does not follow through with this; we are taken rapidly to the end point of almost no return, but she is interrupted by Norman's arrival. Next, her disappearance is soon afterwards represented as suicide, to enable her to escape the town more easily (2.2), and allowing for a replaying of the idea of suicide twice in the same person, and ultimately to allow for this character, the female role model with regards to suicide, to 'die' three times. There is certainly also something very ritualistic about all this; the viewing screen as the altar of malevolent invocation.

The male role model with regards to suicide in 'Bates Motel', Norman, also 'dies' at least three times; his first suicide attempt in the forest (2.10) is thwarted by Norma, his alter-ego, and he is, later on, the only one of them to survive the attempt to kill himself and Norma together (4.9). Other suicidal occasions include his suggestion to Norma that they kill themselves, and that they 'don't belong in this world' (4.2), and when he tries to stimulate a near-death experience to jog a blackout memory by submerging himself under water in the bathtub, again thwarted by Norma. He also comes very close to suicide again after Norma's death, when he panics at the realisation that she is really gone, and rushes to grab a gun and put it to his head (4.10). This is stopped at the last moment by his imagining that Norma is not really dead after all, when he hallucinates the sound of her piano playing. He also comes very close to dying from hunger and exposure when locked in a box which is partially wedged into the earth (2.10), apparently for three days, which one is invited to read as the common ancient religious motif of the resurrected god; in this case, apparently, Norman, the 'norm', is also a god of death.

The subtle message to vulnerable members of the audience, as with all Hollywood vampire and zombie storylines, which have also proliferated for obvious reasons in recent years, is that suicide or death would not be the end of your current life which you might have thought it would be (!), while also making the death theme all the more prevalent through repetition. This is achieved in '13 Reasons Why', for instance, using voice recordings made by the dead anti-hero, as well as extensive flashbacks. The message about death not being a finality, but being, instead, artificial, in a 'Wile E. Coyote' sense, in order to take the edge off any misgivings which a suicidal person might have about going through with this final act, is also pushed hard in 'Bates Motel' in the character of Norma throughout Season 5, since she continues to have a very real presence in Norman's life, appearing to have as much autonomy as when she was alive. After all, Norman had told her before killing her that they were meant to be together 'forever'. This theme also prevails in Norman's hallucinations of the dead dog, Juno (her death caused by Norman), herself a representation of Bradley Martin, and in an incident when Norman hallucinates that the pigeon he is cutting into, as one of his taxidermy projects, comes alive in his hands, this at the same moment he hallucinates Juno barking.

The continued presence of characters beyond the points of their deaths, while sometimes being an enticement to commit suicide because-it-is-not-so-bad-after-all, also contributes to the recurrent reminders of the deaths and killings, such that these are milked, and allow the theme to permeate the entire fabric of the story without taking the numbers of actual deaths to absurd levels where the audience would tend to consign the tale to fiction much more than they would if the number is more contained or believable (unrealistic though the numbers are, anyway). Thus, the given number of at least 30 significant killings, along with the death theme itself, becomes infinitely augmented, as well as being neatly represented by the taxidermy theme, cross-referenced, of course, as mentioned, with Norman's predilection for old movies. Indeed, taxidermy, as well as equating people with animals, of course, is intentionally conflated with the mummification of dead people, even if this were not an obvious enough allusion already, in this series, stemming from the original movie as it does. Thus, when the undertakers ask Norman if he would like Norma's body embalmed, he responds by discussing his hobby (4.10). Besides the methods mentioned, the milking also comes in the forms of repeated visits to the cemetery, repeated dialogue references to previous deaths, Norman's flashbacks of killings he has carried out, including that of Audrey Ellis Decody not actually being dead when he put her body into the freezer (4.2), the lingering death of Bradley Martin's father who remains in a coma for a while before dying, the return of Zak Shelby when his corpse is placed in Norma's bed (1.8), and Emma's death sentence due to her cystic fibrosis, with the tension, in her case, increased each time we are treated to her running short of breath, news about her reducing lung capacity, and her deliberation about whether or not to undertake her lung transplant (3.10).

Some effort is also taken to depict the killings in a variety of ways, presumably in order to traumatise us with the message that death for each one of us can come at any time and in any manner, especially prematurely and violently. Thus, we are treated to a great number of deaths by gunshot and stabbing, as well as by car, which in one case is intentional, when Dylan runs over the unnamed

junkie (1.5). Furthermore, Norma is killed by gas poisoning, Audrey Ellis Decody ostensibly by strangulation, and at least one other person is burned to death. On the whole, the killings are muted and quick, in the manner of the original movie, and even unseen, as when Alex Romero discovers Clay DuFont sitting dead in his car, having been killed on Bob Paris's orders because of the risk of his existence leading to the discovery that Bob Paris was responsible for the killings of Annika Johnson and Lindsay Davis (3.5), but there is, again for variety and effect, the occasional resorting to graphic depiction, as in Norman's flashback to his killing Jim Blackwell while in his Norma persona. This death also involves the freezer, another hard-hitting domestic reference, and also a vision of Norma cutting his throat and repeatedly plunging the knife into his body, his blood standing out stark and dark on her dazzlingly bright blouse and hair (5.1). This memory is accompanied by Norma's comment to Norman that 'We would die without each other'.

There are other deaths more peripheral to the storyline, often undepicted, but helping to further extend the theme of death and killing, as if this is the one defining feature of life in this world, its omniscient aura, its inescapable, normalised, warp and weft. Norman's father is a prime example of an extra-storyline death, sitting (lying on the floor, actually), setting the tone of the entire series in the opening scene. There is also Norma and Caleb's mother, the Chinese sex-slave girl buried in the forest, the cursory killing of at least eight men in the cannabis business, as well as the attempted killing of Zane, and the man set on fire and hung from a post in the village, due to rivalry and retribution, the unresolved but presumed killing of Audrey Ellis Decody, and the three gun-smugglers killed by Caleb and Dylan. Death and killing even becomes a form of communication, whereby one party 'sends a message', to another party, by killing someone, or delivering a corpse to them. Besides the corpse of Zak Shelby which Norma discovers in her bed, this occurs with the body of Marcus Young, delivered to Bob Paris by Alex Romero (3.7), and when Alex Romero finds Clay DuFont dead in a car (3.5).

Furthermore, death is a theme occasionally referred to in the dialogue, as when Norman tells Cody, when they first meet, that 'once we're born, that's [dying] what we're doing' (2.2), or when Will Decody tells Dylan that 'not enough people want to donate their organs' (3.7), referring to prematurely dead people, or reminding us that we are all corpses just waiting to happen. The novel 'Crime and Punishment' is also mentioned by a parent complaining at the council meeting (2.1) that this is inappropriate for school students to study as it discusses a murder and its perpetrator sympathetically. Also, after Norman has retrieved Norma's corpse from the nighttime graveyard, in true bodysnatcher style (4.10), Chick Hogan tells him, 'You do what you have to do. But you do understand: she's dead'. Finally, regarding the movies Norman watches, 'Double Indemnity' (2.8) echoes the story of a husband murdered for an insurance claim, as happened with Norma's husband, Sam.

Generally speaking, there is an air of deadly violence in White Pine Bay, including a number of fires being set, including the burning of Alex Romero's house, the burning of the unnamed man hanging from the post in the town, and the killing of Bradley Martin's father primarily by burning. Alex Romero's comment that Dylan knows 'how things work around here' (2.10) also references this often-lethally violent behaviour. And from the outset, we are primed to expect killing at any moment, such that we are unsurprised when Norman is sitting rather intimately with Marion Crane in her motel room, then relieved when he panics at the strong possibility that his Norma persona will kill her at any moment, and immediately ushers her away from the motel (5.6)

As a sub-category of this Narrative, mainly because it is more about a FWO attack on the U.S.A. Constitution's Second Amendment, than about death per se, guns are portrayed frequently, and as weapons of lethal and pre-emptive, menacing violence, rather than as a form of protection, with most of the killings carried out with guns, and guns making their own appearances generally, like a dangerous character waiting to happen. Within the family, for instance, after meeting with Remo to collect a gun, although this may have been intended for self-defence against his brother, Dylan kills Norman with it (5.10), easily outperforming Norman's attempt at killing him with a knife, with a similar scenario played out between Zane and Jody Morgan. This is designed to show that guns are more

lethal than other weapons, in a facile attempt to hoodwink the viewing citizenry by ignoring every real aspect of this 'debate'. Still within the family circle, Chick Hogan is threatened by Norma with a gun, though she does not pull the trigger, allowing for Chick Hogan, as with the near-suicides, to join the list of those with the attribute of multiple deaths (4.6). Earlier on, Norman gets a gun and bullets from Norma's room (2.10), which she had been given by Dylan, after he had made his point that 'You and a gun is a bad idea', even though she had cited her need for it as a matter of self defence in the face of a very real threat. In one instance, Dylan points a loaded gun at Caleb, his father and uncle, who has merely turned up at the cabin to offer him money as a gift (3.1). In true old-school style, we are shown here, as in many other scenes, that ill-intentioned people can force others to do anything they want just by waving a gun around; again, real self-defence is not portrayed. As mentioned, Norman's Norma persona also tells him to kill Caleb using a gun (5.3), also adding Caleb to the list of multiple-death roles, while Dylan is another such candidate, being attacked by Norman, and otherwise shot at a number of times, including Nick Ford's attempt to shoot him, which backfires when Dylan ends up shooting him accidentally during the ensuing struggle. Norma is also shown needlessly shooting a gun to destroy her phone (3.6), this in order to tell us that, really, people are too free in their use of guns, and cannot be trusted to use them responsibly. This is especially true in the case of Norma and Alex Romero, whose minds and capabilities we can, to a large extent, respect. In fact, when the trust between Norman and Norma breaks down (4.2), she runs to get her gun, but he has already taken it for himself, so that we can be given another tense instance of a gun being in the hands of someone dangerously deranged.

This sub-Narrative is clarified when Alex Romero is needlessly and pre-emptively shot by a child who is apparently trying to defend his family property (5.4). This is presumably intended to be an illustration of why guns are not to be trusted in the hands of homeowners in defence against malevolent intruders and trespassers, and care is taken to use Alex Romero, known as a reasonably fair character, and with no violent intentions towards the property owners, as the example here, as opposed to the type of nervous and desperate criminal one would encounter in the real world (5.3), and which is, in fact, exemplified by the killer, Jim Blackwell, who arrives at the motel to break in and kill Norman with a gun, but is successfully dealt with using a large knife (5.1). Another instance of reckless gun use by young people is that of Bradley Martin's killing of Gil Turner, with the gun she had discovered among her father's effects. In this case, the event is mixed in with female power and sexuality (2.1), though it is also noteworthy that Bradley Martin is, in fact, a home intruder. Other such recklessness is also obvious in the character of Zane Morgan, an egoistic imbecile whose gun use results in the needless deaths of many, as well as the virtual end of the local cannabis economy.

The prevalence of guns, as well as gun culture, in this tale, is apparent not only in the liberal use of guns by police officers Alex Romero and Zak Shelby, but also among the criminal class, exemplified by the proliferation of guns at Chick Hogan's house (3.2), in a scene laced with tension and menace, and his employment of Caleb and Dylan to deliver a massive load of guns to an out-of-town mob (3.8), a situation echoed in Zane's earlier request for Dylan to collect some weapons (2.4). When Caleb and Dylan meet the mob, of course, they find three guns being pointed at them, which swiftly moves on to the intention to kill them with a gun, a situation they escape from using Caleb's own concealed gun. Other gun-toters include every member of the cannabis businesses, of course. Chick Hogan, carrying some dead rabbits on his shoulder, also points a gun at Caleb for no reason when he meets him by chance in the forest (3.5), a tense situation because of our awareness that Chick Hogan is an eccentric and unstable character, another example of guns being allowed in the hands of 'the wrong people'. Furthermore, a gun is also the means of the would-be suicides of both Norman (2.10) and Bradley Martin (2.1), and in both cases, they acquired these weapons by rooting through their parents' belongings, a way of pointing fingers in that direction, and generally decrying the irresponsible way that guns might be kept by adults at home.

Finally, Alex Romero is shown to be a prolific gun user. After being shot himself, by Bob Paris's goons, he escapes from his hospital bed to shoot his rival, Marcus Young, in the parking lot (3.6), by way of revenge and sending a reply to Bob Paris. Ultimately, he kills Bob Paris with a gun too (3.10). Later on, he collects a gun easily from his office, intending to take his revenge on Norman

for killing Norma. After his escape from prison, he is frustrated by Maggie, at whose house he stays after being shot by the boy, because she has hidden his gun. In these scenes, we are shown his increasingly deranged fixation on killing Norman, which revolves around his having a gun for the purpose, even though, presumably, he could achieve this in another way quite easily. Soon after, he is back at the Bates house, and ends up killing Chick Hogan, very abruptly and needlessly, it must be said, with his gun (5.8), then moves on to his former police department, removing Norman from custody and taking a hostage, Regina, by waving a gun around like the proverbial magic wand (5.9). Regina is very traumatised by the ordeal, overreacting largely because of the presence of the gun, and even though she is only asked to drive Alex Romero and Norman into the forest. There, Alex Romero puts the gun to Norman's head, by way of forcing him to reveal Norma's burial place (5.10). Of course, Norman was warned that this could happen by Sheriff Jane Greene (5.5) when she earlier mentioned that Alex Romero might be coming for him, adding, for our benefit as much as Norman's, 'Just so you know: he's armed'.

## Narrative 6: race

While race is a common major Narrative among Hollywood products, it appears to be underplayed in 'Bates Motel', for the sake of the recipe. Since it can never be completely neglected, traces are evident. Firstly, the race Narrative is omnipresent simply due to the portrayal of the town where 'Bates Motel' is set as being a traditionally 'WE' settlement, as evidenced in the demographics of the cast, and the town's name, White Pine Bay, easily ascertained to be more than intentional. Furthermore, there is an echo of this in the name of the bar which Norman frequents in Season 5, 'The White Horse Bar'. Being a 'WE' settlement, of course, it has no positive attributes, because as Sam Loomis tells Marion Crane, 'It's claustrophobic. It's small and boring and everybody thinks they know who you are'. Citing these reasons as a way of avoiding alluding to the fact of the town's demographics as opposed to her own, 'NWE' status, he adds, 'You don't belong in a place like that' (5.5).

Tradition, of course, is also a target for destruction in 'WE' countries, and thus also needs to be demonised. All other Hollywood portrayals of bigoted, small-town U.S.A. are conjured up, for instance, in Zak Shelby's statement to Norma, that the community has its own way of dealing with things, rather suggesting that it is a law unto itself (1.2), and when Alex Romero tells Zane Morgan 'how things work around here' (2.4), while the same phrases is used by Alex Romero speaking to Dylan (2.10). This refers to the aforementioned widespread corruption. There is an unusual portrayal of tradition in the behaviour of Chick Hogan, who is shown to be idiosyncratically mindful of the past, and since he seems to have a strong sociopathic streak, fascinated only academically by Norman's illness and all the killings, this helps to cast all of his own actions in a negative light. For instance, he goes to some trouble to use an old typewriter to write his story about the Bates family (5.3), lovingly restores Norma's broken stained glass window (4.6), and disposes of Caleb's corpse ceremoniously (5.4). Tradition would also apply to the wearing of plaid shirts, which Hollywood has long since seized upon as being a way to present typical 'redneck', 'WE' men, also presuming that we will indirectly interpret this image to signify racism, which, in turn, is due to other, long-term media misrepresentation of U.S.A. history. Since this subtext and motif are so successful and unobtrusive, they are almost over-used, and 'Bates Motel' is no exception; the number of plaid shirts to be seen, almost exclusively on the men, is practically beyond counting, while Norman, for one, seems to have an inexplicable number of different plaid shirts. Furthermore, there is the fact of continual habitation of the area which, although colonisation and land-theft is not mentioned, result from the generational inheritance of gains ill-gotten, as well as bestowing the advantages of privilege in terms of power and prestige, all deemed a negative characteristic of such communities. As such, powerful or influential positions in the community are reserved for 'WE' people, such as the mayor, the sheriff, and business leaders Bob Paris, Jody Morgan, Nick Ford and Jake Abernathy, with the Bates Motel itself representing such undeserved inheritance, having been in Keith Summers's family for a

century (1.1), while Bob Paris tells Alex Romero, concerning his role at The Arcanum Club, 'I'm just the elected president' at the club 'set up by our founding fathers' (3.4).

As mentioned, the terrible crimes committed in White Pine Bay can be attributed, presumably, to its lack of diversity; even if this idea bears no relation to reality, and even though the very opposite can be easily evidenced, it is a media-wide narrative to which 'Bates Motel' contributes its own pennethworth. Not only this, but racist behaviour is also in evidence, as when we see Alex Romero being rude to the doctor caring for him after he has been shot (3.6). Indeed, the appearance of 'NWE' people, as a minority in the cast, draws an ideal amount of attention, and if they are portrayed as victims, they are nevertheless not shown as being weak in any way. On the contrary, 'NWE' people are predominantly shown to be well-meaning, or a force for good, on the whole, rather than otherwise, as with Alex Romero's doctor, but also with Emma's doctor (4.1), and Norman's therapist, Doctor Edwards, who also receives bonus Liberal points for being 'gay'. In addition, a line is given to a 'NWE' male DEA agent who represents the heroics of burning away all the cannabis crops (3.1), while Special Agent Liz Babbitt is the leader of the DEA operation to storm Bob Paris's house, and otherwise pursue the case of his laundered money (3.10). In contrast, 'WE' medical staff are portrayed as unsympathetic, as with the public hospital where Norman wakes up after killing Bradley Martin, as well as in the Pineview Institute with the lady who tells Norma about all the reasons why it is impossible to have Norman cared for there (4.1), at which Norma is presumably distraught because it conflicts with her feelings of presumed historical self-entitlement and privilege as a 'WE' person.

The 'NWE' victim list includes the would-be 'NWE' sheriff, Marcus Young, killed by Alex Romero (3.6), the Chinese girls trafficked and enslaved by Jake Abernathy and Zak Shelby, Ethan, killed by the nameless junkie, and Marion Crane, who holds the main 'NWE' role in the series, finally allowing, in the final season, for some 'NWE' back-story, which is supposed to stand for those of 'NWE' people everywhere: she has worked hard but come up against a glass ceiling in the professional world, which we may attribute to her being 'NWE' or to being female; you can take your pick, but Marion Crane gets almost maximum Liberal points for being both. She is shown to have been economically disadvantaged since childhood, having not been able to acquire a university degree, and lives with the feeling of being an outsider. As she tells Sam Loomis, 'I never felt like I belonged anywhere', and later on, Norman, 'All my life I played by the rules, been a good person, and where's it gotten me?' (5.6). We are invited to feel a sense of outrage at this presumed injustice, and are thus sympathetic to her appraisal of herself as deserving of anything she wants, as if the only thing ever preventing this were her 'NWE' or female status. This even extends to Sam Loomis, whom, deserving of zero Liberal points, she denigrates by telling him that she has been patient in waiting for him, saying, 'You don't think I have other options?'. [So much for devotion, fidelity, and meaningful relationships; true colours, Marian?] Unfortunately, Sam Loomis joins in with this praise of her and denigration of himself, with, 'I know you have options [...]. I know I don't deserve you [...]. You deserve the world. I want to be the guy who gives it to you' (5.5).

Finally, there is the brief moment with the 'WE' couple who check in to the motel with a 'NWE' child, presumably adopted (4.2). You can draw your own conclusions easily, while such placement looks to be deliberate enough to prove to anyone with a pulse how much attention is paid to detail in the promotion of such Narratives in Hollywood products, as well as being an illustration of how brazenly they are showcased. The conclusion, which is as obvious as such showcasing is, is that there is an absolute confidence, among the echelons from whence such Narratives issue, that the audience is inured enough to such propaganda so as not to notice, or 'dumbed down' enough to not notice, or persuaded enough of the rightness of the sinister path to applaud it, or terrified enough of what their peers, colleagues and family might think of them should they hesitate to join in the cheerleading of such propaganda.

## Narrative: other

There are a couple of other noticeable points made during 'Bates Motel' which, although contributing to the Agenda, are not truly part of any of the main Narratives. Possibly the most pervasive of these is the prevalence of the cannabis-cultivation business in White Pine Bay, which, for the first two seasons, is the main source of income and employment for the local residents, even though it was, at the time the series was produced, illegal to produce and sell cannabis on such a large scale. This component of the storyline was useful, while it lasted, as the vehicle for other Narrative points, such as the necessity of the police department and other officials to be portrayed as being easily corrupted; great profits are available to those who occupy the higher positions in business and officialdom in this community, which includes Alex Romero. As mentioned, the corruption label is being attached to 'WE' people, since this is a very homogenous town. Besides this, because the selling of cannabis is so relatively lucrative, operating outside the law with no oversight or taxation, it also works as a marker of laziness; a good living can be made without putting in much effort. Without commenting on the wisdom or otherwise of this approach to life, it is notable who is being aligned by this intimation in the series. The further benefit is that, because the stakes are quite high, competition is shown to drive the people involved in this business to commit violence against their competitors, which makes for a reasonable excuse for a display of violence committed by 'WE' men, epitomised by Nick Ford and Zane Morgan especially in season 2, and allowing for the contrasting personality of Jody Morgan, who is shown to operate the most successful of the cannabis businesses out of a love of horticulture and creativity, while being opposed to violence, and ultimately becoming another casualty of male violence.

The other thing to mention regarding cannabis is that its use among the audience, the normalisation and expectation of this, is also being cultivated and promoted. Although there are good things to say about cannabis, long-term, extensive use of it can, in some users, affect brain functioning. However, the main purpose of promoting its use is that, in the short term, it is a soporific. Its benefits as a relaxant, for many users, means that it serves to dull perceptions of reality, pacifying those would-be 'rebellious' inclinations among the population, the young adults who are being anything but rebellious by acquiescing to this programming; these smokers, in their semi-comatosed state, are not apt to consider the evils of the world being perpetrated by the FWO, and they are certainly not apt to put up any kind of resistance; as long as they can get their prescribed escape from reality, they will never question the evils of the system which provides this. This clever game has been spun out for decades, with the FWO having to tread carefully the line between promoting this tool which works so well in helping to pacify the population, and maintaining its popularity by keeping it 'illegal', and therefore somehow 'cool' because, in using it, one is being a 'rebel'. Obviously, no regime has the right to authorise what you can or cannot do with your body, and drugs should not be illegal anyway; the selectivity of which drugs are illegal and which are not, including all pharmaceuticals, is very telling on this point. It should also be mentioned that one of the many known cures for cancers is the oil which can be obtained through processing specific parts of the cannabis sativa plant, which is the one - of the two - cannabis plants which will never be legalised, for this reason. This is another cause for concern, among the FWO, with cannabis legalisation, since the discussion and research of these plants would make this knowledge too widely available, and could blow a hole in their cancer industry and its affiliated beneficiaries.

Also, restricting access to, and making certain substances illegal serves only to make them attractive to the undiscerning, with the other point being that limited education and censored information, restrictions on developing the cerebral potential of humanity, enhances the effect of such canny marketing of unhelpful substances; in a lawful and normal world, people would be properly educated and informed before making their choices, rather than being, as we are, dumbed-down, expendable slaves. This is why a small issue such as cannabis can, in fact, be very important, and the vehicle of such a storyline is a gift of expediency for the FWO on this issue; if the businesses which sustained White Pine Bay were aspirin and ice cream production, instead of prostitution and cannabis, the power of the other Narratives would suffer. On the other hand, White Pine Bay can be seen as a microcosm of a nation, since the illegal drug industry is extremely important to our



regimes, not only because they destroy people's lives and prevent thinking, questioning and resistance among the slaves, but also because they are so profitable, for regimes and individuals alike, which is largely due to the drugs' 'illegal' status. As such, many Hollywood products have tried hard to promote more damaging illegal drugs, ironically through some form of glamorisation. Indeed, they have arguably been successful in their objectives, but one can surmise, in the case of 'Bates Motel', that perhaps there had been too little promotion of cannabis in other Hollywood products, and that a more severe substance in 'Bates Motel' would have significantly detracted from the Narrative recipe.

Following this theme, it is interesting that law-enforcement is commonly featured in many Hollywood television serieses; one of the main characters always seems to be a sheriff. This can be useful in demonising or lionising certain societal groups, as discussed in relation to 'Bates Motel', but is also very useful in promoting the idea and maintaining the illusion that this institution functions in order to police society for the good of its chattel, the citizenry. One of the fictions in this regard is that the 'authorities' running whichever regime you might be trying to mind your own business under are interested in confiscating the 'illegal' drugs and prosecuting those who run 'illegal' drug businesses, as well as other 'illegal' businesses such as the facilitation of child rape and human trafficking, for instance. This is why the DEA have a role to play in this series, as they did in 'Breaking Bad' and 'The Wire' (2002 - 2008), as elsewhere. In 'Bates Motel', we are shown the planning meeting for the arrest of Bob Paris (3.10), while even Rebecca and Alex Romero are hounded for laundering and trying to acquire his money following his disappearance (4.9).

Another, lesser issue raised in 'Bates Motel' is home-schooling, which is something, obviously, the FWO is very much against. In this case, care is taken to show that Emma and Norman spend practically no time at all on their studies, so no comment is being made on it, in order to not draw attention to it (3.1). However, it exists in the storyline in order to show it to be unglamorous and suitable only for misfits: the physically lame and the socially inept; Emma, in fact, jumps straight into so-called university education as soon as she is cured of her malady.

As a final aside, it is amusing, not to mention shamefully disingenuous of the scriptwriters, when Chick Hogan mentions to Norman that the story he, Chick Hogan, is writing about the Bates family, 'could make a good little movie' (5.4), the implication being that good scripts or good stories are the ones which have the best chance of succeeding. Not only this, but he is seen typing away while living in a trailer, as if scripts which become Hollywood product could ever emanate from a grass-roots level. However, like an actor directly addressing the camera, this draws our attention back to our real world, and the fact that, according to the thesis of this book, good stories and good scripts are far from being the criteria for what attracts funding or promotion in Hollywood; it is only in a parallel Hollywood universe that this might be possible, where Hollywood might be at all meritocratic, whereas, in our universe, as bears repeating, the propaganda is the overarching priority, being requisite, in every aspect and every detail, for any script. The only way in which Chick Hogan's story might be acceptable, therefore, in the real world, is if he has written the 'Bates Motel' script itself. [Sorry, Chick; if only you had known: it was just never going to be.]

# 7

## Okja 2017

### the storyline

Lucy Mirando has taken over from her twin sister, Nancy, as the director of the globally successful Mirando Corporation, founded by their grandfather. She is giving an inauguration speech to the staff, while also informing them of the launch of the ambitious Super Pig project. We are given indications that this has been carefully rehearsed, and includes the planting of collaborators in the audience to contribute scripted statements, while Frank, the brains behind the Mirando Corporation, is shown in the shadows, mouthing Lucy's lines and anticipating audience responses.

The main points she makes are that her grandfather was a terrible CEO, while all the directors lacked humanity, and presents herself as a more fun face of the corporation, espousing new core values of 'environment' and 'life'. In relation to the Super Pig project, she mentions that 'The world's population is at seven billion' and mentions global hunger and running out of food. The Super Pig project is Mirando Corporation's solution to this, breeding the creatures to not only be very large and fleshy, but also very tasty. She tells the audience how the first Super Pig was 'miraculously discovered', brought to the U.S.A., and raised by scientists, who reproduced 25 more 'by non-forced, natural mating'. These Super Pigs were distributed around the world to different countries, in order to discover some ideal conditions for their breeding, as well as being a publicity stunt. For this, a celebrity veterinarian, Dr Johnny Wilcox, a 'fun' scientist, who hosts a television show, 'Dr Johnny's Magical Animals', with global distribution, has been made the public face of the project. Lucy adds that the farmers were asked 'to raise their special guest honoring traditional techniques unique to their respective cultures', resulting in 'a whole new species; Mama Nature's gift; a revolution in the livestock industry'. More to the point, a competition is announced, as part of the product launch, to find the largest Super Pig, after a ten-year interval.

Those ten years later, we see the hero, Mija Joo, a young girl who lives on a mountain in Korea with her grandfather, Hee Bong Joo, and one of the Super Pigs, a female called Okja. Mija spends her days wandering around the mountain with Okja, and is shown to remove a thorn from Okja's foot, as well as inducing her defecation by patting her belly. Being time for dinner, they start for home, but Mija chooses to try a short cut which delays them and almost kills Mija, but Okja puts herself in great danger by falling off a cliff to save her. Up at their house, Hee Bong has cooked dinner. He tells Mija that the local Mirando Corporation representative, Mundo, is coming to see Okja, though he will not say why. We now suspect that Mija is not aware that Okja belongs to Mirando Corporation. Hee Bong has been telling her that he has been making regular payments to purchase Okja, although Mija calls him 'a tightwad' because he is using an ancient television which barely works.

Mundo arrives with a television crew, including Dr Johnny, just as Mija is cleaning Okja's teeth. They are all out of breath from the great climb, while Dr Johnny is riled by it. We are shown his general

disregard for others in his rudeness, which includes drinking some of Hong Boo's alcohol without asking, and demanding they bring him water. He is very impressed when he finally sees Okja, however, and they film his reactions for the camera, and photograph Hong Boo and Mija wearing their 'first prize' sashes. At this point, to get Mija out of the way while Mundo takes Okja away forever, Hong Boo asks Mija to accompany him to visit her parents, who have been dead for many years already, and are buried nearby. While there, he digs up a gift for her, a small, gold pig, which is what he had been spending their money on, rather than purchasing Okja. He tells her that such a gift is traditional for a daughter who is getting married, at which point she becomes suspicious, and races back to the house, only to find Okja gone. She sets off running down the mountain after Mundo and Okja, but is too late, seeing the truck in the distance disappearing around a bend on the road below. She marches back to the house and hurriedly prepares to go after Okja immediately, taking some coins and the gold pig, while Hong Boo, in a panic, remonstrates with her, finally explaining that Okja's fate is to become meat on people's plates.

The next morning in Seoul, Mija reaches the Mirando Corporation office and asks the receptionist about Okja. Being refused entry, she dramatically breaks in and runs around looking for a clue, soon spotting Okja outside being loaded onto a truck. She runs after it, chasing through the streets, and manages to jump down onto its roof, hanging onto a rail. Because the bridges are too low, however, she makes her way to the back door instead, and is banging and shouting for Okja when another truck, carrying members of the ALF (Animal Liberation Front), pulls up alongside and tells Mundo and the driver to stop, that they have come for Okja, but will not harm anyone. Mundo's driver, although he cares little for his job, does not stop, but they are forced against a wall in a tunnel, whereupon the ALF release Okja, who reunites with Mija and runs out of the tunnel, with everyone in pursuit. Once in the street, Mija pushes Okja down some subway steps, perhaps hoping to be able to hide her, but this ends up in serious damage being done to a supermarket and other stores down there, where Okja finally comes to a crashing halt. The Mirando Corporation security officers catch up and try to fire tranquilisers at Okja, but the ALF block these with opened umbrellas, while their leader, Jay, pulls a ceramic splinter from Okja's foot, thus gaining Mija's trust. Somehow, the ALF with Mija and Okja all escape into their truck in the adjoining parking lot basement, and they escape their Mirando Corporation pursuers. The ALF plan is underway, and after introducing themselves to Mija, explain that they want to tag Okja with a camera, so that when she is taken to Mirando Corporation's holding facility in New York City, they can acquire incriminating evidence of cruel conditions there, in order to expose the company's deceptive publicity stunt, and hopefully save many Super Pigs from the slaughterhouse, millions of which are being slaughtered already. However, they want her permission for this. She does not consent, but their translator, Kay, decides to say that she has consented, whereupon they clip the camera onto Okja and all jump out of the moving truck to leave Okja and Mija to be picked up by the Mirando Corporation and taken to the competition in New York City. Soon, Mija is reunited with Hong Boo at Seoul airport, while Mundo, amidst the media attention, tells him how the turn of events could be a lucrative opportunity.

In New York City, Lucy is in an executive meeting, both showing off and fretting about the Super Pig project being jeopardised by the brush with the 'terrorists'. Frank suggests the solution of using the image of Mija for greater publicity, which annoys Dr Johnny, who was enjoying being the face of the project. Later, Lucy receives a telephone call from Nancy, who tries to put her down, while having a portrait painting of herself delivered to Lucy during the call. Okja is delivered to the Super Pig laboratory, where Dr Johnny arranges for Okja to be mated with a male Super Pig, as well as painfully extracting some samples of her flesh for the tasting staff. The ALF are watching and recording all of this nearby, and Kay confesses to them that he had lied about Mija's consent, whereupon Jay savagely beats him and tells him he is no longer a part of the group.

The climax of the Mirando Corporation competition takes place on stage in the street at the end of a parade, at which many people are eating free Super Pig samples. Inside, Mija is being coerced into putting on her costume, and being kept away from Okja until the unveiling, their reunification being the planned addition to Lucy's celebration. Elsewhere, Frank tells Lucy that Nancy is in town, which adds to her anxiety. She takes nervously to the stage, in pink, after Dr Johnny has warmed

up the crowd and told them the Super Pig story. When Okja emerges from her tent, Mija finds her erratic and unresponsive, while the occasion starts to fall apart as soon as the ALF hack into the video system and play the filmed recordings of Okja's suffering at the laboratory, as well as raining information leaflets onto the crowd, and telling the truth about the project over the speakers. During this, Frank is having lunch with Nancy, so that we realise he has been working for her all along, against Lucy's interests, and that he may have been involved in the sabotage of the show. He confirms that they have an arrangement with the local police, as well as a paramilitary group of their own, Black Chalk. All of this is then unleashed on the crowds below, targeting any protestors, while the ALF try to escape, as planned, with Okja and Mija. The escape fails, however, despite Kay's return to collect the wounded Jay. He drives Jay and Mija to the farm where the Super Pigs are being slaughtered, hoping to rescue Okja from there. Nancy, having assumed leadership of Mirando Corporation in place of Lucy, has ordered full production there to commence immediately, and is making her own way to the facility with various CEOs.

At the farm, it is night, and they cannot find Okja among the large herd. Mija sneaks into the slaughterhouse through a back door, and arrives at the place where the Super Pigs are being killed using an electric hammer, just as it is Okja's turn to be killed, and gets the worker to pause. At this moment, Nancy and her entourage turn up, as well as Jay and Kay. Although Nancy will not allow Mija to take Okja away, she agrees to sell Okja in exchange for the gold pig which Mija has been carrying with her. Mija leaves with Okja, walking down the alleyway between the electrified fences, to the sound of the Super Pigs being killed in the shed, though they manage to rescue a baby Super Pig hidden in Okja's mouth, pushed under the fence by its parents, eliciting a cheer from the whole herd. Back at the mountain, all is as before, with the addition of the rescued baby Super Pig. Finally, we see all members of the ALF group on a bus together, having just been released from prison. They all put on balaclavas, ready for the next mission which has been arranged to happen imminently.

## Narrative 1: gender

Gender features strongly here, with our suspicions first aroused by the appearance of the female CEO, Lucy, and followed soon after by Mija, evidently the true hero of the piece. We also discover that Okja, the Super Pig, is female, and this role represents the female who is repressed through not being given a voice, being valued only in terms of her body, which is equated to some extent with her appearance, being owned, traded and not valued as a living creature, as well as being tortured and mated, which equates to rape. Thus, Okja represents a feminist ideal in terms of narratives related to the lives of women, while Mija and Lucy represent the other side of the feminist coin, in playing the strong, powerful and clever heroes succeeding against the odds in a male-dominated world. Needless to say, all of these portrayals are fantasies deployed in the guise of entertainment, in support of the age-old game where brutal ambitions of theft and control will do anything to push their agenda forwards; in this case, the useful idiocy utilised is the threadbare, mendacious diatribe of latter-day feminism.

Unpacking the Okja character a little more, we are shown how her destiny was marked out by greedy capitalists even before she was born, that her ten years with Mija were, at best, living as a pet, while also being a kind of incarceration; she is trapped by her ignorance of the world, making her materially dependent on Mija and Hee Bong, and also by her emotional attachment to Mija. This is an open-prison or house-arrest arrangement which expediently supports her portrayal as a victim. Also, in equating her with the dowry item of the golden pig, the idea of marriage, possibly forced, is introduced into the equation, being overlapped with a similar fate to be imposed upon Mija. While Okja, under the auspices of Lucy at Mirando Corporation, is going to be forced into a breeding programme, she is also a dowry, which brings the same idea of marriage into the life of the young Mija. Thus, we are looking at both characters as being eligible for, or vulnerable to, marriage.

Interestingly, with Mija's pursuit of Okja as a life partner, rejection of the dowry, and ultimate trading of the dowry for Okja, we are settled upon a kind of 'marriage', albeit platonic, between Mija and Okja, a same-gender 'marriage'. While such a conclusion might appear to be far-fetched, we should remember that we are speaking of symbolism, and in that light, the elements are very powerful, especially when we consider even the least extreme of these interpretations: that Mija's election to forego traditional marriage for a life with a Super Pig, which looks to be manageable beyond Okja's demise from old age, with the addition of the newly-adopted baby Super Pig which they rescued from the Mirando Corporation farm, is a rejection of men; cleverly, without even featuring men as a part of this message, they are being sidelined, as the message which pertains to them remains unsullied by even referring to them. This symbolism is subtly supported by the fact that Mija and Okja sleep together, while the ceremonial element of a wedding between them is presented in the guise of their reunion at the Super Pig competition. After being separated for some days, although Mija has asked to see Okja before her unveiling, this is not permitted; a scenario reminiscent of a wedding tradition. Our suspicions that, in this same-gendered relationship, Mija has been given the role of the male, is confirmed by Okja's being secluded in a tent until the last moment. Finally, we should consider the parallels in the names, also designed to equate Mija and Okja: two-syllables, ending with 'ja'.

Despite her victimhood, there is an empowerment side to Okja, who, according to her name, is everything good and positive; flawless, literally being, in German parlance, 'all correct' / 'yes'. We are shown a few times how really intelligent the Super Pigs are, while Okja also enjoys hero status. The incident when she sacrifices her safety to save Mija's life is illuminating, as she is shown to have made a good calculation of how to achieve this, then to be able to show some mock-resentment towards Mija in order to make her point that the danger was all due to Mija's poor judgement. There is the occasion when Jay removes the splinter from her foot, which allows us to see her making the link between this action and Mija's, at the start of the movie, while Super Pigs are generally shown to be very intuitive, as when Okja is shown making mournful sounds when she sees a cemetery from the truck as she is being driven to the Mirando Corporation laboratory. The most striking example, however, is the way that the condemned parents at the Mirando Corporation farm understand that Mija and Okja are escaping, and that their own fate is hopeless. Understanding also that Mija and Jay are on their side, they make a calculated guess that their child will have a chance of surviving if they push her through the fence as Mija is passing by with Okja. Not only this, but the anticipation of this plan's success is immediately and invisibly transmitted to the entire herd in the farm, who celebrate this with their voices raised in unison.

Mija, as a female hero, is ideal in being young, both in order to suggest not only that there is great potential remaining in such a person, whose will, determination, physical endurance and righteousness might only increase as she becomes an adult, but also that the strength and powers of those who operate in the 'man's world' are no match for hers. While her attributes include decisiveness, independence, versatility, bravery, intuition and logic, as well as compassion, she also has adequate physical prowess, making good use of running easily and athletically about the mountain and the city, jumping onto Okja's back to ride her, clambering around on the outside of a speeding vehicle, and dramatically shattering the large glass doors at the Mirando Corporation office with a single kick. There is also the moment when she blocks the blow being brought against Okja by Jay with the microphone stand. This incident is intended not only as a display of physical ability, but also of wisdom; she understands, as Jay does not, in this attempt to prevent the drugged Okja from biting her, that Okja could never do such a thing, however delirious. Similarly, she knows that Okja can understand what she says to her, and is also able to quickly surmise that her grandfather has been colluding with Mirando Corporation to take Okja away from her.

Meanwhile, Mija's kindly and compassionate nature is evident in the effort she makes to steer the careening Okja out of the path of a sick, wheelchair-bound lady in the supermarket. She is also shown removing a thorn from Okja's foot, an archetypal motif for true compassion, and care is taken to make sure this is the first thing we see happening between them. Indeed, Mija is shown, in her caregiving role, especially during this introduction in the forest, to be the provider of their food, the

leader of their way, despite the disparity in their sizes, and the decider of their schedule, which even extends to enjoying greater importance than her grandfather, since she is the one to be shown bringing home the bacon (fish, fruit, etc.), while he is the collector of the less important firewood and, more to the point, the one to take on the traditionally feminine role of cooking their meals and calling for Okja to come home to eat.

Mija's priorities are also shown to be correct when she demands to speak to Okja on the phone when the Mirando Corporation staff are trying to photograph her outside the airport when leaving for the U.S.A., making her point by breaking their publicity sign. In fact, Mija's boldness is featured throughout, so we are unsurprised at her ingenuity at the farm, in saving Okja's life. To achieve this, she gains access through a back door, runs through the corridors and arrives at the butchery area. Finding the place where the worker is killing the Super Pigs using a pneumatic hammer against the forehead, she distracts him just as Okja arrives, next to be slaughtered. Being unable to do anything physically, she uses her kindly aspect to make the worker pause, by showing him a photograph of her and Okja when they were both young children.

Other promotions of Mija's capabilities include her ability to learn to use some English within a few days, which starts industriously as soon as she is on the plane. We are also prompted to consider that she has not been recognised for her part in raising Okja. Dr Johnny addresses the father when he first sees Okja's impressive size, asking about what methods he used. No reference is made by anybody to the fact that Mija has spent all day, every day, apparently, keeping Okja company in the forest. Hee Bong answers, 'I just let her run around', and a first prize sash is put onto each of them for a photograph, all of which draws our attention to the fact that Hee Bong played no part in raising Okja and deserves no such credit. This is a typically feminist narrative, of course, which also serves to denigrate men in a few ways.

Regarding Lucy, as well as her sister, the most obvious thing is that their role is to show us that this globally successful corporation is being run by women. Not only this, but care is taken to show that they are senior in position to men; that men are subservient to them. In Lucy's case, she is also portrayed as a victim, not only of her father's discouragement since childhood, 'a man who called his child an idiot loser', but also of the collusion between Frank and her sister, Nancy, such that the same woman, because they are twins, can be shown to be both victim and humanist, as well as an effective and 'manly' business prodigy, and Nancy continues to be invoked as cold-hearted in order to allow Lucy's humanist side to shine. As Lucy's 'plant' in the audience announces, 'You're much more fun than the last chief executive'. Incidentally, any of Lucy's failings as a business person might be easily ascribed to her treatment by her father when she was a child.

Lucy focuses on the personal image the corporation should project, and starts out saying that she wants to tell the staff 'a beautiful story' about a 'precious little girl' (the first Super Pig), thus collocating 'beautiful', 'precious', and 'girl'. Later in the storyline, she boasts that, at college, she was 'visualising new and better ways of doing business [...]; visualising ways of turning the most hated agrochemical company in the world into the most likeable, miracle pig-rearing company'. She further boasts, 'I took nature and science, and I synthesised. And everyone loved it', then mentions that Mija has unfortunately been abused by people wearing 'the uniforms that I personally designed myself', while also taking the trouble to describe Mija as 'that adorable girl'. Also, when she mentions that 'Now, the rotten CEOs are gone', she is not only referring to her grandfather and father, but also her sister, as we are shown the article alongside their photographs in a newspaper. Nancy is thus also a mask for the denigration of men, and so qualifies, like Frank, as a complex and significant role, while being a minor character. Regarding Nancy, Lucy also mentions that, unlike herself, 'She's totally ignorant about humanity', and when mentioning global hunger, adds that 'We're not talking about it', which is to say that she is the only one, when compared with all the powerful men in the imagined 'man's world', who is both able to identify the problem and willing to 'talk about it'. Indeed, she frames the entire product launch as her own humanitarian gesture aimed at resolving the issue of world hunger, again compared to Nancy who, when she was CEO, was 'dumping so much toxic waste into Moose Lake that it exploded'.

Further instances of Lucy's denigration of men arise when she tells the staff, 'We all know that Grandpa Mirando was a terrible man', which also seems to chime with what we are supposed to think of Hee Bong. She continues, 'We know of the atrocities he committed in this space', a reference which appears to get out of hand when she adds, 'We know these walls are stained with the blood of fine working men'. It is difficult to know what she means by this, but we might presume it has something to do with dangerous working conditions regarding machinery. What is important is that this is not specified, however, and that the audiences are to apply their imaginations to this description. Later, she also describes her own father as a psychopath, quipping, in support of an arguably commendable, albeit leftist, anti-war sentiment, "What did you do in the war, Daddy?". "I manufactured the napalm that made everybody's skin fall off". She also says of Nancy, 'She really frightens people. She reminds them of Daddy, while Nancy, in her turn, tells Lucy, 'Daddy was a terrible man. He was a real horror'. Finally, regarding the role of a woman as CEO, in replacement of those men, Lucy also states, 'Today, I reclaim this space', and we should note the use of 'reclaim' as opposed to 'claim', as if running Mirando Corporation was her stolen birthright. Although the previous CEO was a woman, Lucy juxtaposes her statement with her damning comments about her grandfather, making this entirely a matter of gender.

Frank, although he has no true character, plays a very interesting and significant role. Like Nancy's it is complex, being a facilitator of more than one narrative simultaneously. Chiefly, as a man, he is shown to be deceitful and traitorous, since he has colluded with Nancy against Lucy, while also fitting that profile of the mercenary businessman. Not only this, but he is also a mask for both sisters, being one of the apologetics which ensures that the power or influence behind their thrones is that of a man. He is also the facilitator of corruption, being the one who has engaged the cooperation of the police and Black Chalk for the sabotage of the parade, and is also likely to have been a driver of the deceitful Super Pig campaign, which ensures terrible conditions and death for our beloved Super Pigs. Such a responsibility would be almost too much for the movie's producers to leave at the door of the women and, since gender trumps race in the 'liberal' taxonomy, Frank takes the hit for all of this.

Dr Johnny Wilcox, meanwhile, is an absurd caricature, intended to represent men, particularly 'WE' men, as being both ridiculous and infantile, and certainly undeserving of any position of influence or academic authority. Lucy first introduces him as a 'fun' scientist, showing video of him being silly with animals, including putting his head into a grizzly bear's mouth, evidently a position for all men which would be favourable to the FWO. His immaturity is also displayed in his rudeness. After a display of undue self-importance, being the only one of the four people 'riled' by the climb to Mija's home on the mountain, and also shown to be unfit compared to Mija and Hee Bong, neither of whom are ever out of breath because of this climb, he proceeds to take some of Hee Bong's alcohol without asking, and demands that someone bring him water, but drops the bottle to the ground, for someone else to pick up, once he spies Okja, at which point his self-importance is reinvigorated when he decides to make the discovery about himself, rather than Okja or Mija, and in a display of outright insincerity tells his assistant, 'Film me, Jennifer. You can't fake these emotions'. His self-centredness also surfaces when Frank prompts Lucy to plan to introduce Mija as the face of the Super Pig campaign, at which point Dr Johnny enters the room, thereby exploiting the additional opportunity to portray him as a sneaky eavesdropper, saying, 'She's not the face of the Mirando Corporation; I am', and 'I am loved...', at which point we are treated to him being severely scolded, and threatened with dismissal, by Lucy, as a display of male subservience to female authority, which would otherwise remain absent from the storyline.

Another important scene with Dr Johnny is at the Mirando Corporation laboratory with Okja, the evening before the parade. Although, as he says, he is 'an animal lover', the message is, rather, that his true nature, one of less-than-sympathetic self-preservation, comes to the surface under the influence of alcohol. He has become drunk in order to do what he has been ordered to do. Since we are speaking of a 'camp' scenario here, Dr Johnny is playing the part of the otherwise well-meaning citizen who happens to be caught up as a prison guard during a war, and follows orders because

he is too unprincipled to refuse. As such, his weakness is supposed to represent that of many men during wartime, as if this were a simple matter, and as if women would not follow the same orders at least as assiduously. Having Dr Johnny drunk during this scene is more in keeping with his character than one of stern officiousness, but it also serves to augment his absurdity, as he wallows in pity, not for Okja but for himself, almost weeping as he says, 'I shouldn't be here'. Dr Johnny's tasks are to have Okja mated with a male Super Pig, and also to extract samples of her flesh to provide to the tasters. The mating is a rape, and the samples are extracted, apparently, against Lucy's wishes, with Dr Johnny taking the samples, in order to spite Lucy, without anesthetic. This procedure will affect Okja's performance at the unveiling the next day, causing Okja great pain, and showing Dr Johnny in a bad light because this is his own choice, rather than being an order. It is also about highlighting the danger of a selfish male ego, with a gender element explicitly introduced through Dr Johnny's statement that, 'When a woman humiliates a man in front of his own colleagues, a man is inclined to make his own decisions'. His tantrum extends to throwing the telephone across the room when a call comes through from Mija, who wants to speak to Okja. Meanwhile, this is all being observed through a window by five men, none of whom does anything to even protest about this, as if they were treating Okja's ordeal as entertainment. Finally, Dr Johnny's insincerity is revisited when he tries to make a public apology on stage as the ceremony is being sabotaged, in the attempt to salvage his own reputation and livelihood. This situation intended to resemble the public apologies of the many such wimps in the real world, after they have been accused of hurting the feelings one of the perpetually offended. In this case, Dr Johnny is cut short by being struck on the head by a projectile thrown from the crowd, in order to show him, for the last time, looking like a clown.

The members of the ALF that we meet comprise one woman: Red, and four men: Jay, Kay, Silver and Blond. This is all quite predictable, with Red championed as the righteous, brave and clever feminine minority outshining the flawed male majority. Blond is shown to be unfeeling in his statement, during Okja's rape, that 'We need to record this', and his vote to use Okja to achieve their ends, even without Mija's consent, for which he is scolded by Red. Silver, agreeing with Blond on this point, is shown to be extremely frail, while being the only one to be wearing a full pink outfit during the parade, and the first one to ask, during Okja's rape, while hiding from the screen behind Blond, that they turn it off. When we first see him, he is practically passing out from hunger, saying 'all food production is exploitative'. This shows him to be ruled by principle and idiocy instead of by logic or compassion, which cues us into a similar interpretation of Jay, who preaches absolute pacifism and love for all creatures, until he discovers that Kay had lied to them about Mija's consent to use Okja, at which point he becomes a murderously violent sadist, beating Kay almost to death. He also resorts to violence, though in his mind for the right reasons, when he attempts to strike Okja with the microphone stand, to protect Mija. This is intended to provide us with his major flaw, as well as supposedly representing all men, and while he might thus have some physical prowess to deploy against the attacks of the Mirando Corporation staff or Black Chalk, this is never shown. In the first fight at the supermarket in Seoul, he is sitting down with Okja, extracting the splinter from her foot, allowing Red to lead the others in their physical defence, at which point she is the first to open out an umbrella to block the tranquiliser darts fired at Okja, as if this clever ploy was her idea, and she is the only one with a (gas) gun, firing at their pursuers while Blond and Silver are left only with the umbrellas. Not only this, but Silver's umbrella is, rather too consciously, rainbow-coloured, attempting to mark him, like his pink costume at the parade does, as a homosexual clown.

Furthermore, at that parade, Red is again the only one with the task of using artillery, firing the rocket launcher to pierce the inflatable pig in order to shower the crowd with the information leaflets. This can be seen as a simple comparison, therefore, between offensive and defensive strategy, although all of this could be categorised under the former. When they are attacked by Black Chalk after the parade, Jay is again at the rear, so that Red, Silver and Blond face the initial beatings of the soldiers. However, once the short battle is lost, Jay is attacked and beaten by four of them, ensuring that we see the three men being savagely beaten, while Red, in the thick of the 'fighting', is simply led away. With Jay's earlier sadistic attack on Kay, the intention is even more inescapable. In addition, all the men are shown in a poor light in the car in New York City when following Okja's truck to the



laboratory, engaged in self-congratulation and unconstructive commentary while Red, the driver, makes the sensible suggestions of testing the strength of the video transmission signal at a distance, and telling the others to be quiet when they arrive at the laboratory. She is also the only one to be shown to have an emotional reaction to the sounds of Okja's suffering in the laboratory with Dr Johnny, finally ordering Kay to turn off the transmission, apparently protested by Blond. She is also favourably compared to men at the start of the first rescue of Okja in Seoul: while Kay is shown struggling with a bolt-cutting tool, to break the chain which holds Okja inside the truck, she interrupts him by simply unclipping the chain from Okja's harness. Her awareness of what is happening also arises when Black Chalk arrive at the parade; she is the one to first notice their arrival, and to shout the warning about this to the others. Finally, Kay's additional flaws are the said deceit, and a childish lack of focus, since the reason he gives for lying is that he 'couldn't stop the mission', not because of its laudable aims, but because it is 'the coolest mission ever; I have all this stuff'. Finally, although it is Blond's quick thinking which buys them all some time to escape the mall in Seoul, any honour is obviated by his using a crutch, rather than anything else which might have been made handy by the scriptwriters, to shove through the door handles, and this he grabs without warning from a woman standing in the parking lot.

The other main male character is Hee Bong, and the main thing to consider here is his deceit about the reason for raising Okja, compounded by his taking Mija away from the house when Okja is being removed, when he gives dishonest opinions such as that he 'doesn't like her playing with that pig all day', and that she 'should go to town, meet a boy...', the latter point, more than any other, marking him as a target for denigration. There is also his general miserliness and greed for money, shown in his using an ancient television set, which elicits Mija's opinion that he is 'a tightwad', and his interest in Mundo's mention of Mija doing Mirando Corporation commercials. He also accepts credit for raising Okja, has a weakness for alcohol, and is the one to first explicitly state that Okja is mere food, not a part of the family as Mija considers her to be; note his mention to Mija that there is 'just the two of us', which Mija corrects to 'Three'. On the whole, his character is underplayed and muted, and although he is generally without malice, beyond the suggestion of marriage, cannot be allowed any redeeming characteristics, not only because leftism, being anti-tradition, is naturally anti-old people, but also because Mija needs to shine out as the powerful and decisive one of the household. This is why he needs to be portrayed as having no power to influence Mija, and is somewhat relegated to being only the house cook, and even dependent on Mija; while he is very upset at her leaving to rescue Okja, not believing in her ability to change the outcome, she is never shown to express any devotion or affection for her grandfather, something which Hollywood is able to manage so easily when required.

Yet more anti-male incidents are scattered 'liberally' across the storyline. There is the fact that both Lucy and Nancy are often flanked by other businesslike men who have the appearance of being powerful, most notably at Lucy's two board meetings following the Seoul scuffle, at which the only other female is her very capable female secretary, and where there are, besides Dr Johnny and Frank, five and ten men, respectively. Besides Frank and Dr Johnny, they are all 'WE' and non-young, and equally importantly, they are completely mute. The picture is as clear as any such portrayal. Regarding Dr Johnny, we are supposed to remain uncertain of his sexual inclinations. The point is that he behaves wackily, ostentatiously and moodily, always wears shorts and colourful shirts, works in a humane profession, and is non-old, which is all supposed to profile him, in the simple minds and parlance of the producers and their intended audience (victims) as a non-traditional, possibly-homosexual 'liberal'. Besides him, the other demographics represented are 'NWE' people and women, and these three are all vocal at the meetings, the intention being to portray the majority, 'WE' men, as dull, uncreative and apathetic, not to mention without influence, and the same is true of the men who accompany Nancy to the killing sheds in the penultimate scene, where she tells Jay, among all the machinery of killing, and speaking for Mirando Corporation, which means its majority-male staff and business partners, 'We're extremely proud of our achievements. We're very hardworking businesspeople'.

More incidentally, although Mija does pass a woman in the killing sheds, the role of the worker who kills the Super Pigs with the pneumatic hammer is a 'WE' man. We could also mention the young Mirando Corporation driver in Seoul, being very unfocussed and irresponsible in his job, Mundo taking a selfie with Okja after scolding everyone else for doing so, the portrayal of ALF men at the parade being easily restrained beside women who are inexplicably besting the Black Chalk soldiery in scuffles, the excessive brutality of the all-male Black Chalk, Lucy's mention of nature as 'Mama' nature, the inclusion of rape in the storyline, which is facilitated by a man, and the ridiculing of the all-male Mirando Corporation security staff in Seoul losing the 'fight' with the ALF, who finally escape them while making them look foolish, slipping on ball-bearings and, in Mundo's case, being showered with Super Pig feces at Mija's instigation. Since we need to account for the fact that every moment in the storyline is carefully considered in terms of propaganda, there is also the appearance of Jay in Mija's hotel room. Ostensibly being there to encourage her and inform her of what will happen at the parade, the ruse of entering through the window using the fire escape, wearing a hotel staff uniform, seems a little gratuitous, until we understand that this is intended to suggest that men are prone to breaking into the private quarters of females, as well as finding this extremely easy to do. [Thanks a bunch, Jay: mission accomplished.]

## Narrative 2: scarcity

This Narrative is not deployed repetitively in the way that the gender Narrative is, but it remains an important one because it retains an ever-presence, providing a major component of the context and premise of the storyline. From the outset, Lucy trumpets her own understanding of what is promoted by leftism, on behalf of the FWO, as a crucial, global issue. The narrative concerning scarcity is also legible as that of over-population, which is also propagandised as a cause of pollution and a chief tenet of the CCH, thus identifying it as the prime target, with depopulation as the holy grail, alongside the fringe benefits of stress, guilt, and misery, and the degeneration of standards of living, and leading to the removal of our birthrights, and absolute control over the planet and all its resources and people by the FWO. Needless to say, all these narratives, wildly invoked in support of each other, sporting a veneer of scientific pretence, are false; all of them are part of the hoax, while some of our very real experiences are forced upon us as 'evidence' for the tenets of the hoax. For example, scarcity, being the chief principle of satanic banking practices forced upon all of humanity by the banking families and cartels in collusion with satanic forces entirely hostile to us, is one of their creations, such that all scarcity which people experience is an entirely unnecessary and easily remedied evil. Still, despite our knowing this, the show goes on, while the useful idiots, as represented by people like Lucy, in fiction as in the real world, boast of their being in touch with these important issues of our time, all in the name of caring for people and the planet, in order to support their fragile and infantile egos; it seems they have to show others how very righteous they are, which is both tragic and ironic. In a display of such corporate cynicism, Lucy is keen on using Mija as the new face of the Super Pig project, for example, because 'She's ecofriendly and she's global', a revelation of how such lexis are used to affect the behaviour of large numbers of people. Lucy also describes Nancy as being 'totally ignorant about humanity', and, in saying of the scarcity of food, that 'We're not talking about it', is showing us that she, however, as a virtue-signal, is talking about it. This bears no relation to reality, anyway, since everybody is actually talking about it, as per the programming and the overall hoax. Nevertheless, in suggesting to the audience, a young and impressionable one, on the whole, that 'We're not talking about it' (even though everybody is), allows people to believe that in supporting the tenets of the hoax, they are somehow at the vanguard of a burgeoning zeitgeist, making it all the more clear that this narrative subsists on ego-bait.

The Narrative is touched upon when Lucy says, 'The world's population is at seven billion', then mentioning global hunger and 'running out of food'. She also says, '805 million human beings struggle with hunger every day, including', as if to drive the message home, '30 million right here in the United States', and mentions that theirs is 'a product launch that will feed millions'. The overlap

with the CCH is more evident when she adds that their pigs 'will also leave a minimal footprint on the environment', and her humanistic concerns are then extended to animal welfare when she mentions that the Super Pigs were reproduced 'by non-forced, natural mating', with the word 'natural' again supporting the idea that being concerned about animals is also to be concerned about the planet. As her opening speech comes to an end, we are, unfortunately, treated to a part of the background song, 'When will there be a harvest for the world?' (The Isley Brothers, 1976), which is echoed in the phrase shown to us on Hee Bong's Mirando Corporation certificate of participation, where it is written 'HARVEST FOR THE WORLD' and 'SAVING HUMANITY'.

All of this is gilded with another edge when Jay tells Mija that she has been lied to. In this speech, he cites the fact that Super Pigs are created in scientific laboratories, demonising their 'experiments' with the phrase 'genetically-mutated animals', adding that genetic mutation, or modification, is dangerous and unnatural. This is something widely acknowledged, even if we are kept as ignorant as possible about the details of why it is dangerous and why it is done, but the point is that animal welfare is being conflated with a popular notion about damaging foods, so that genetic modification and toxification of all our foods does not need to be discussed, qualifying this mention as a whitewash: the issue belongs to the world of fiction, it has been understood and addressed, but any true concern about its details is removed from the common audience member because it is associated with an unconventional minority who, being covertly funded, are able to spend their time disrupting the lives and welfare of others. It is interesting, incidentally, that the ALF, being fully leftist, are portrayed as heroes, and this is done in order to invite our sympathy and support for the brownshirtingly illegal, extremist, leftist activism which goes unpublicised and protected in the real world; we speak here, for instance, of the fascist group known as 'antifa', a public face of the regime-sponsored violence of every kind which is carried on by 'secret service' personnel at the behest of whichever regime you live under.

It will be noted also that Lucy's comment about leaving a minimal environmental footprint is echoed in Silver's abstinence from eating. As Blond explains to Mija, 'He's still trying to leave the smallest footprint on the planet that he can', as if this, in principle, were a good example for us. To reiterate, in case anyone is unaware: any lack of resources is artificially engineered, and any ways in which we are said to be polluting the environment are perfectly preventable without sacrificing any standards of living or changing of lifestyles; the technologies, concealed by the patent scam and other forms of suppression, exist to cleanse our air, forests, and bodies of water of any size, as well as provide literally unlimited energy which does not deplete any resources at all. It is not our business to make the changes, especially not within our own lives, because this is not in our hands; it is in the hands of the FWO in all its forms, and just as the pollution is entirely their doing, so is it their responsibility to make the changes. Of course, this is not within the bounds of possibility under current circumstances, since we are dealing with psychopaths, although our one hope is the ongoing progress in collective human consciousness which, for most people, entails waking up to what has really been going on, and undergoing the ordeal of a black-pill re-education, in order to understand the enemy and the need for real change. It is this author's contention, however, that this information can be more interesting and entertaining, as well as inspiring, than any of the fodder supplied by the FWO.

Silver's abstinence is simply his extreme version of vegetarianism or veganism, and one of the hopes of the FWO is that people are fooled into malnourishment in these ways. While some people are able to stop eating meat, or even all animal-based food products, while remaining healthy and strong and retaining robust immune systems, such people are in a tiny minority. One may cut down on such products and experience health improvements, since there are specific toxins and hormones in animal products as in all other foods, which may not agree with us, and many people simply eat too much meat, for example, which may not suit their body type. The point is that everyone is different, and must decide for themselves, but the question of animal welfare is a very real one; holding producers to account for the way animals are treated and slaughtered is to be applauded, but the FWO is not concerned with any such matters; it is intent on the degeneration of our health, immunity and longevity, in service to the Agenda, and the promotion of vegetarianism is

a case in point. While vegetarianism is not explicitly cited in this movie, we are led to the suggestion through our empathy with Okja, for whom we want to care as much as Mija does. Thus, to consider that her fate is to end up on people's dinner plates could start many people thinking about their own selfish part in the exploitation of animals for food, with the scale of the issue highlighted in the visuals at the farm and slaughterhouse, and Jay's telling Mija that 'Millions of genetically modified pigs are being slaughtered'. We are also provided with the horror of Dr Johnny's extraction of the five samples of Okja's flesh, for the delectation of the Mirando Corporation tasters, whom Dr Johnny tells us are 'halfwit, degenerate fucktards', the scene when Frank and Lucy, whom we despise, eating and savouring a Super Pig product, the miserable conditions at the laboratory, farm and slaughterhouse, and Jay's comment to Mija that 'Soon, the supermarkets will be filled with their flesh and organs'.

## Narrative 3: race

While there are some Hollywood products which deal with race overtly, which means championing the virtues of 'NWE' people, along with some rewriting of history, there are many others now which achieve similar ends covertly, which means denigrating 'WE' people without featuring 'NWE' people. To do so, they can use a predominantly 'WE' cast, and simply show them in a bad light, while throwing around some tired historical references and symbols, and including a token few 'NWE' people in the cast. This adequately secures the Narrative, while the modus operandi of lionising 'NWE' people and demonising 'WE' people hits home across the whole storyline through posting less subtle incidents at intervals. The anti-'WE' narrative dictates that we should despise and denigrate 'WE' culture and achievements, even though they are monumental and beyond comparison, while venerating the cultures, and any achievements which exist, of all 'NWE' peoples. This idea is briefly inserted into Lucy's opening speech, when she tells us about the 'esteemed, local' farmers around the world, who were asked to raise their 'special guest', meaning a Super Pig, representing 'NWE' people, 'honoring traditional techniques unique to their respective cultures'. The fringe benefit of this is that we are given an example of people being distributed around the world, and welcomed into others' homes and cultures, in support of the weaponised migration agenda. Incidentally, it is also notable that the first Super Pig was 'miraculously discovered' in Chile, a 'NWE' country according to our working definition. As such, the Super Pigs represent a product or discovery which has been stolen from 'NWE' people, and exploited, with the subtle suggestion that theft or exploitation of 'NWE' peoples and countries is a common business practice of 'WE' people.

Regarding Frank, one of the token 'NWE' characters, as mentioned, he is indispensable for the gender Narrative, but also serves the race Narrative by being the brains and engineering behind the shenanigans of the sisters, with the negative traits and outcomes being attached to them since they have the full responsibility, and he is really an employee following orders. Since Nancy's plan succeeds, we can conclude that he is very clever and astute, as well as being every bit the businessperson that Nancy is. The success of this globally dominant corporation is, in fact, due to his mind and business acumen, but it also requires the nastiness inherent in the 'WE' people to allow his plans to be implemented. Besides this, the sisters, although they are capable and female, cannot match Frank for brains or knowledge, and both of them actually depend on him. The logic runs as follows: For the impact of the gender Narrative, Mirando Corporation is evil, so has to be run by 'WE' people, and Mirando Corporation is successful, so cannot be due to the abilities of 'WE' men. However, neither can it be entirely due to the abilities of the women, since they are 'WE'. The most obvious occasions showing the extent of his influence are at the second Mirando Corporation meeting, where he suggests using Mija as the face of the Super Pig product while allowing Lucy to think it was her idea, and when he is having lunch with Nancy as the parade arrives in the street below, and at the start when we see him in the shadows almost like a conductor of the speech being given by Lucy. And his muted role in the storyline also fits his purpose among the Narratives, since he cannot appear to be more in control than the sisters. Meanwhile, his subservience is also

convenient as a subtle reference to 'NWE' servants employed by 'WE' people in the past, almost bordering on the slavery narrative.

Other 'NWE' characters would include the female, hero-victim combination of Mija and Okja. As in other movies, the inclusion of non-human species, as in science fiction, outer space ones, or in animal-focussed ones such as 'Zootopia' (2016), stands for different races and the self-debunking narrative of idealised multiculturalism. As such, Okja and Mija stand at the pinnacle of deservability and victimhood in the 'liberal' taxonomy, being both 'NWE' and female. On the other side, at Mirando Corporation, we are dealing with the two other main characters as females, but they are both 'WE'. Indeed, it all starts to appear very dualistic. In the ALF, however, there is only Kay as 'NWE'. Thus, the group of five also has its perfect composition, with the two victimhoods of female and 'NWE' people represented. Like Red, then, Kay comes with useful skills. Like her, he can be a driver, and he can also manipulate technology. When he is removed, Blond makes some use of the equipment to finish the mission, but does not have the same abilities; it has all been set up by Kay. As such, Jay is the unskilled 'leader', and Silver is the zero-skilled wimp, contributing almost nothing to the mission.

Beyond this, Kay is also victimised by being brutally and unnecessarily beaten by Jay, allowing us to reach another milestone on the taxonomy totem pole: 'NWE' as a victim of violence, while also being a male victim of violence; the modus operandi dictates that women cannot be shown as being vulnerable to physical attacks unless it serves the purpose of demonising men. Not only this, but Kay's virtues as a 'NWE' person are highlighted when he returns to save Mija and Jay with a getaway vehicle after they have been attacked by Black Chalk, and arranges for Jay's injuries to be operated on, in the truck, by a capable surgeon, also 'NWE'. Finally, the use of 'NWE' people as physical labour at the slaughterhouse is intended to show us how they end up having to do the worst kinds of unskilled jobs, as if they had no choice, and all these people are shown working through the night; one of them appears to have the grisly chore of sweeping Super Pig blood into a drain, for example. Lastly, on the heroic side, there is the almost imperceptible moment when Dr Johnny is struck by the bottle thrown from the crowd at the parade. Care has been taken in this case to make it obvious that this was thrown by a 'NWE' person, because the man in question, rather too consciously, is an Indian wearing a turban. In addition, we should also consider how, because of their names, Blond and Silver are as 'WE' as can be.

The denigration of 'WE' people, by comparison, is unusual in being deployed mainly through women, the two sisters, but this only shows us how significant this Narrative is to this movie. Besides, it can be included in this case since the main objectives of the gender Narrative have been otherwise achieved, allowing for such unusual flexibility. The effect is striking because the twins are both powerful women, while also being demonised. They exist on both sides of the ideological divide, and while the familial estrangement Narrative looks like an expediency for pitting them against each other, it is more to the point that they are identical twins, and represent, therefore, two faces, Janus-like, of the same person, looking in opposite directions. Also, in storyline terms, they are being designated as two-faced, since the Super Pig story being sold to the public is not the truth. This is a sign of exceptional artistry on the part of the screenwriters and producers, and qualifies this movie, all the more so because it is deceptively facile and sometimes distractingly amusing, as a complex one, the result of the extensive efforts of great minds, albeit misapplied. Such complexity, furthermore, makes the case for the need for audiences to become all the more Narrative-literate.

As twins, there is also the message that this represents a single person, making them their own worst enemy. Their names help with this, in the way that those of Okja and Mija do: two syllables, with the second syllable identical. They are evidently flawed, of course, being deceitful with each other and with the customers of Mirando Corporation. It appears that their material and financial success has not cured them of what must be their congenitally evil tendencies, which exist mainly because they are 'WE'. Nancy has no conscience, being the one heard giving the order, even while Black Chalk are still breaking up the parade, to 'get every pig into production', which to the audience, in their recognition of the Cruella de Vil archetype ('101 Dalmatians' (1961)), means an orgy of

killing. And while a sense of entitlement features in her statement about Okja to Mija, in refusing to release her, that 'It's my property', we are really being shown that she does not see the Super Pigs as living beings, since she refers to Okja as 'it', while also brushing up against the slavery narrative again. This selfishness parallels Lucy's statement to Frank, that 'This is my project', possibly selected as another way to 'twin' them. Furthermore, another instance of Nancy's sociopathology is her pointing her thumb downwards as a way of ordering Okja's killing, in the way of a Roman emperor at a gladiatorial contest. As Kay and Jay tell her, 'You're a fucking psychopath', and 'You should be ashamed of yourself'. Finally, care has been taken to insert a racial comment from Nancy, 'The Mexicans love the feet. I know. Go figure', which would have remained practically invisible not long ago, before the circus media of latter-day identity-politics was launched, but which is an incendiary device in today's trigger-unhappy world.

Lucy, as a separate person, provides a slightly different example of the 'WE' person who persists in being evil even though they know it is wrong. As she says to Frank while they are sampling the Super Pig product, 'Such a shame we had to tell all those little white lies', then, blaming others, adding, 'It's not our fault the consumers are so paranoid about G.M. foods', thereby denigrating the general public, in a way, apparently, that only 'WE' people can. Besides, her investment in the saccharin version of the Super Pig story, the humane face of Mirando Corporation, is evidence of inflated deceit of others, as well as self-deceit, and thus some mental instability. Perhaps she chooses to wear white, in her opening speech as elsewhere, as a signifier of integrity, but we are also intended to read this, along with her unusually white skin tone, as a signifier of extreme 'WE'-ness. Furthermore, it is more obvious in her case than in Nancy's, that she is trying to prove something by running Mirando Corporation, whereas running such a business is more natural and easy for Nancy. Besides her skin, though, what Lucy also has in common with Nancy is a brattish sense of entitlement and sociopathology. As Frank tells her, after she has mentioned that Nancy frightens people, 'You frighten people, too'. This true aspect of Lucy's nature arises in the revealing, closing line of her opening speech, when she says that the Super Pigs 'need to taste fucking good', a sure negation of her foregoing pretence of compassion. In the second Mirando Corporation meeting, seeing her Korean staff arresting Mija, she impulsively asks, 'Who are those morons? Find out and fire them', without a thought for the context or the financial security of those workers. And when Dr Johnny protests that he should not be replaced as the face of the Super Pig project, she coldly tells him, 'Could you sit down and shut the fucking squeaking and whining [...]. Sit! You're a deadbeat. Your ratings are shit! Epic fail!' Meanwhile, care is also taken to insert a modicum of callousness into her thinking about 'NWE' people, when she tells Jennifer, her capable 'WE' assistant who is intent on getting her bonus, to get Mija to New York City, as if Mija would have no say in this, and 'Don't force an image on her, like Benetton did with those Asian models'. This detail is telling since it parallels Nancy's throwaway comment about Mexican people.

The sisters are also shown to be undeserving beneficiaries of an inheritance which reaches back far enough to have been built on the exploitation of others, again brushing up tacitly against the slavery narrative. Besides Lucy's comment that the walls of the factory in which they are standing 'are stained with the blood of fine working men', care is taken to show us a newspaper article headlined with 'MIRANDO'S HEREDITARY SYSTEM'. This is intended to support the anti-'WE' narrative that 'WE' people have no right to anything which they own, as if it was all either stolen or acquired through stolen labour. In this, we are also being prompted to consider that Frank would be a more capable CEO than either of the twins. Furthermore, all the faults cited against any of the 'WE' men can also make double entries under the race Narrative, while other minor, anti-'WE' suggestions include the fact that all three tasters of Okja's flesh, immediately after they have been painfully extracted without anesthetic, are 'WE' people, two of them being men. The use of white coats is also notable, on Dr Johnny during Okja's torment at the laboratory, and on the CEOs accompanying Nancy on the slaughterhouse visit, while we are also shown flecks of blood spattered on the white, rubber glove of the killer of the Super Pigs, quite literally an instance of blood on white hands.

Finally, the name of the mercenary group, Black Chalk, is another sophisticated choice, too explicit to have been accidental. Very cleverly, it can serve as an appropriate label for people who work out of sight, under the radar, leaving little trace of their activities, in the way that black chalk used on a blackboard might. But, especially since Black Chalk do not wear black, this appears to be metaphorical, also serving as an interesting paradox in stating that 'black is white', or that 'white is black', thus telling us that appearances can be deceiving, and working as a metaphor for the deceitfulness of 'WE' people. This is also interesting considering that adherence to leftist ideology practically necessitates extremes of cognitive dissonance, so that the name Black Chalk has a kind of resonance with our experience of the world, serving to help in the normalisation and acceptance of self-contradictory information. The weight of numbers would always count against 'WE' people, as it does in Hollywood products like this one, when dealing with 'black' or 'white' deceitfulness, such that the apparently equal denigration of both, in the mercenary group's name, is not equally interpreted. Certainly, deceit is what Black Chalk are about, regarding their legal status, and it is shown to comprise almost exclusively 'WE' men, who, despite their great physical strength, are shown being effectively resisted by women and 'NWE' men, while 'WE' men, for the purpose of painting them, as usual, as weak and deserving victims, are easily restrained by Black Chalk. When it comes to their main task of arresting the ALF, however, the playacting in the main crowd gives way to brutally life-threatening violence, against the three 'WE' men, anyway. This is intended to show us that the nature of 'WE' men is to be excessively violent or cruel, especially in militaristic groups, in the way of the Rodney King event, and great care is taken to include a 'NWE' man in their number, as a mask, who, as mentioned, appears only twice, but committing no physical violence against anybody. Indeed, the main indicators of careful choreography here is crystal clear if one focuses on the roles played by that 'NWE' man and by Red.

Since Black Chalk wear green camouflage instead of black, we are also supposed to interpret them as being non-'antifa', but, instead, similar in some ways to the 'far right' groups invented by fake journalism. Ironically, there is the suggestion here that there are unprincipled, mercenary groups of 'WE' men who are, or can be, hired for the purpose of attacking 'liberals' and those designated as society's 'victims'. But it bears repeating that the fascist grouping known as 'antifa', among others in disguise, such as crowd infiltrators and agents-provocateurs, perpetrate the worst atrocities of violence against any non-leftists they wish to target, while no violence is ever perpetrated by those groups labelled as 'far right'. Any such labelling related to rightism is not only a misnomer based on ignorance, but also a designation applied by fake, mainstream, regime-sponsored media, and not by any such groups themselves, while any reported violence by people so designated is always shown, without exception, to be a false flag event, or outright falsification. This is because violence and lying, as mentioned, is a necessary component of leftism. As such, the label Black Chalk is very appropriate, because the truth about all reporting of publicly militant violence in the real world is completely inverted. All of this, of course, takes place on the freemasonic, allegorical checker-board of time and space in this world, where all the pieces, including the pawns, are controlled by the unseen minority, the real players.

## Narrative 4: familial estrangement

This Narrative is fairly prominent mainly due to the two circumstances of the enmity between the twins, Nancy and Lucy, and Mija's leaving her grandfather. Regarding the sisters, there is a definite rivalry surrounding control of Mirando Corporation. At one point, Lucy confirms this by saying, 'This is mine. This is my project'. However, Nancy takes after their father, being hard-nosed and presumably effective in business, while Lucy thinks she can run the business more humanely. As Lucy says in her opening speech 'We're very different people'. Even though Frank, recognising which side his bread is buttered, is Nancy's agent, the main betrayal is the familial one, since it also involves spite and true dislike. It appears that Nancy has allowed Lucy to run things, apparently for ten years, not only in order to humiliate her and prove once and for all that she is too incapable to

ever try this again, but also so that she can steal the lucrative Super Pig project from under her nose as soon as she has demolished Lucy's confidence and reputation; she orders the full-scale slaughter of the Super Pig stocks as soon as Black Chalk arrive at the ceremony with Okja and Mija, and has planned, quite literally, to rain on Lucy's parade. At that moment, when we finally see them together, Nancy takes an opportunity to turn the knife in the wound, saying to Lucy, 'For a while back then, you forgot you were such a loser' and reminds her that she knows nothing about business, then walks away with Frank.

Meanwhile, we are witness to Nancy taking trouble to undermine and stalk Lucy, when she telephones her one evening to spook her and discourage her, mentioning the bad publicity she is receiving abroad, and threatening her insidiously by having a painted portrait of herself delivered to Lucy during the call, saying, 'I've sent you a reminder of the true face of the most powerful CEO Mirando has ever had'. This is a bleak, face-on image of Nancy unsmiling, cold-heartedly watching over Lucy, while also being a mirror of her self-defeating, inner self. This is followed soon after by the anti-encouragement of, 'You go, Girl!', which is really an invitation to make a mess of the project launch. Just before the parade, then, Lucy is especially stressed when Frank tells her, according to the script he has worked out with Nancy, that Nancy is nearby, telling him she had told him to keep Nancy away because she frightens people, also nervously asking, 'Is she watching me?'. Finally, it is the business itself which serves to divide the sisters, which is to intimate, again, that such people do themselves a disservice by prioritising material wealth over anything else, and that business, which is to say capitalism or the free market economy, is the one thing that has come to divide all people. That this is an intentional message is mystically evidenced through first name initials, such that 'L' (Lucy) and 'N' (Nancy) are divided by nothing else but 'M' (Mirando (Corporation)).

Both sisters speak very disparagingly of their father, while Lucy also castigates their grandfather, and no female parentage is mentioned, so we can discern an absent or estranged mother. While an absent father would be the default option, the father's presence ensures that they can inherit Mirando Corporation, mention how bad he was, and have their characters' worst traits blamed on him, thus playing mainly to the gender Narrative. Family relationships are thus painted in a poor light, and there appears to be no sign that either sister will have children of their own. Meanwhile, no other family members of anybody are featured or mentioned, besides Mija with her grandfather, and, after Mija has rescued Okja from the slaughterhouse, the infant Super Pig pushed onto Mija by its parents, another permanent separation. Indeed, Okja has no parentage to speak of, either, the first Super Pig having arisen or been discovered 'miraculously', as if no parents existed, and the first generation having been 'raised by scientists', according to Lucy's speech. Reproduction, meanwhile, is equated with rape, and there is no romantic element whatsoever included in the storyline, discounting the muted hints of a bond between Blond and Silver.

We also discover that Mija's parents are long dead, and she tells her grandfather 'I can't remember their faces', while not answering his question about which parent she misses more. Their removal is made real by showing us the place where they are buried, and quickly forgotten in the sudden development of Okja's departure. That evening, Mija packs and leaves her grandfather, without any remorse, blaming him for the loss of Okja, whom she consider to be one of the family. In fact, in line with a common element in Hollywood products, strangers are more than adequate as replacements for family. While this is partly evident from Mija's family, in which her blood relative is sidelined in favour of two adopted Super Pigs, it features most strongly in the ALF grouping, in which commitment to the cause, rather than each other, is their priority. As young adults, these five people, as usual, appear in the world being of independent means and without any apparent familial background, and proceed to show us once again how nothing can be achieved independently; that group work, not family (or individual) work, is the only way to get anything done, something illustrated twice over in the removal of painful objects from Okja's foot.



## Narrative 5: the 'holocaust'

Interestingly, the whole Camps gig is reserved for the latter part of the movie, and appears as a surprise, being so obviously a Nazi Germany reference; it seems out of place here, in what is ostensibly a family movie. We are softened up for the camp itself, however, with the Mirando Corporation laboratory in New York City. This is portrayed mainly as a grimy, well-used facility, as if the dreadful things which happen here have been happening for years. It is windowless and dark, with dim and ugly lighting, and we are shown Super Pigs in their cramped and filthy cells, and the use of an electrocution prod on Okja. While all the World War Two referencing is intertextual, this place is reserved for the torture and scientific experimentation, and here we would be referencing stories of German scientists who experimented on prison camp inmates, though the reports of such atrocities, as always, would be exaggerated or fabricated, as well as negligible when compared to the war crimes of the so-called 'allied' powers of the FWO at that time. Nevertheless, the Hollywood mythology persists, and we see the unfortunate Dr Johnny in the position of being such a scientist, complete with superfluous white coat, begrudgingly carrying out his orders with his self-pitying diatribe, saying things such as, 'I shouldn't be here', but also rebelling against his superiors at the expense of the inmates, which in this case means Okja and the sampling of her flesh for the Mirando Corporation tasters. He points out for us, as if for emphasis, that this is a 'wretched laboratory', and 'an unspeakable place', and that, despite what Okja has endured, 'there are worse rooms out there'. This was all foreshadowed in Jay's original comments to Mija, about the 'scientific laboratories' where the Super Pigs are created, and 'where Mirando experiments on their genetically-mutated animals'.

The main camp scenes are those of the farm and the slaughterhouse, and the portrayal of this place as a prison camp, being open-air, with electrified wires strung between concrete posts, where the central building is the one where the Super Pigs are systematically killed and butchered, is all intended to reference the German concentration camps. The fact that this all happens at night, when the feeble lamps are shown at their 1940s best, regularly spaced along the fences, is also intended to heighten the sense of death and misery, such props having been used to such good effect in 'Schindler's List' (1993), for instance. The killing itself, taking place systematically and in a designated building, is intended to reference the mythologised 'gas chambers' of the camps. Mira first arrives at a drain for the blood, and sees hanging Super Pig corpses and butchery, all industrialised and all under harsh lighting. After purchasing Okja from Nancy, they leave on foot along the lane between the fences, to the sound of the Super Pigs being shot dead, and being herded into the killing shed, while the Super Pig parents attempting to have their child rescued by Mija and Okja serves to tell us that the Super Pigs are intelligent and sensitive enough to know what their fate is, making the cruelty all the more obscene, as well as equating the Super Pigs with human beings here, so that we associate this camp with those which have existed in history. This also compounds the obscenity when we realise that either the Super Pigs spend their whole youth in the camp, being fattened up, or, more likely, that children are also being killed, again paralleling the Hollywood and FWO Camp mythology. We should refer, however, to the main Narrative here: the Camps are invoked in order to portray women as ultimate victims.

## Narrative: other

A few more narrative points of lesser importance, but equally intentional, are part of the storyline. The first of these is a whitewash of the activities of large corporations. We will remember that whitewashing in this context actually means placing issues in the full light of day, in plain sight, so that they can be ignored in the real world, having been both consigned to the world of fiction, and considered as having been adequately addressed. This parallels one of the functions of other propaganda media, such as 'news', where there is a show made of investigations into corruption or

crime at every level. Being an effective device, it is also hidden even more by virtue of its complexity, since people will generally refuse, in all their 'informed' 'wisdom', to ascribe methods involving such detail, planning or widespread deployment, to the regimes under which they live, while those who consider themselves the most level-headed will, after having been so magnanimous as to concede that suspicious governmental patterns exist, ascribe these to administrative incompetence, and leave it there. This is known as Hanlon's razor, another little firewall along the way, to throw the more cerebrally-inclined, who might make it through the other firewalls, off the scent. Also, in pretending to address the problem of the damage to our lives by large corporations, this movie is also attacking the institution of capitalism which, as we know, is considered to be an evil by leftism. As such, it needs to be demonised by just the right amount, another 'recipe' consideration.

In addressing the evils of monopolistic corporations, which are likely to be integrated with the banking cartels, national regimes, the military, and the rigged stock markets, all to the detriment of nearly everybody on the planet, we are shown cynicism, mendacity, deceit, exploitation, and institutionalised, damaging and inhumane business practices. As Jay tells Mija, for instance, 'Because genetic mutation is too dangerous, Mirando's been disguising it as natural, safe and non-G.M.O.'. Another brush-off arises in Frank's comment that they have been called psychopaths by the 'crazy radicals' since the 60s. Ironically, leftism and Hollywood is about recruitment and indoctrination of 'crazy radicals', and this is just another way to get the audience on-side, especially if they are focussing their antagonism towards the corporations at the fictional Mirando Corporation, and believing that Mirando Corporation is as bad as it gets; if one is against Mirando Corporation, then one might be a 'crazy radical'. Very hip for a ten year-old, no doubt. The whitewashing thus requires the negative aspects of a target to be paraded in front of us, so that we can feel the extent of the 'exposure'. For instance, when Lucy mentions that Mirando Corporation had previously dumped 'so much toxic waste into Moose Lake that it exploded', and describes Mirando Corporation as 'the most hated agrochemical company in the world', this all serves as cover for industrial toxic polluters. Tragically, Lucy's stance might get some people to believe that such industrial behaviour can be redeemed, given the right people at the helm to synthesise, as Lucy says, 'nature and science'. Mija, our boots on the ground, is confronted by the cold face of business throughout the movie, including the near-innocuous moment when Jennifer bullies Mija into cooperating at the parade, saying, 'We are the ones who have Okja. We are doing you a favour. Do you get it now?', adding that Okja 'will be steak' unless Mija cooperates. And we are certainly on Mija's side when, as if this were 'revenge' enough to placate us, she snaps the Mirando Corporation advertising board, which they have given her to hold and be photographed with, at the Seoul airport. Even the deceptive use of language is unmissable, a good example being when Dr Johnny is telling the crowd the Super Pig story at the parade, saying that the Super Pig was 'invited to this prestigious occasion', even though we know it was a kidnapping, drawing us, yet again, within throwing distance of the slavery narrative. There is also Frank's illegal arrangements with the police and Black Chalk, while he and Nancy can also satisfy some of the audience that shadowy interests and influences in industry have also been adequately exposed. This movie also makes a point of ridiculing the sisters, and making caricatures of them, which is cathartic enough, it may be hoped, in the way of preventing any real resistance to such corporations. If this were not clear, we have Lucy's assistant, Jennifer, to point it out, saying of Lucy that 'She can't get enough of herself', and Frank and Nancy's contempt for Lucy.

Leftist 'protest' groups such as the violent, fascist, brownshirt group known as 'antifa' are also being whitewashed by the inclusion of the ALF, which makes the point a few times that they have a policy of not harming anyone, obviously an absurdity regarding the fascist 'antifa'. In fact, the ALF are shown to have a very humanistic side, representing the vegetarian and pacifist agendas, programming the better-hearted among us to be unresisting in the face of the FWO's violent oppression, much as in the way that Christianity was designed to leech violent tendencies from messianic Judaism. When the ALF are released from prison, for instance, they are shown to be quite jolly with each other on the bus, and have been joined by the lackadaisical Mirando Corporation truck driver from Seoul, and are all ready for their next mission against Mirando Corporation, starting immediately. Sympathies for the leftist ALF are also invited because they are all young, and leftism is more able to recruit young people because they are more easily able to accept the starkly

simplistic dogma, without tending to consider the repercussions. It should be remembered that if such a group did exist, it is impossible that it would be able to operate undetected or without being infiltrated, and eventually co-opted. The message here is that our societies are not so totalitarian after all, that freedoms of expression, protest and effective resistance, as well as the ability to communicate subversive information to the general public, all exist as part of the choices we have in our 'democracies'. Meanwhile, the ALF's target is unstintingly Mirando Corporation, thus taking the focus away from regime institutions, where the blame more correctly belongs.

Here, we might segue into other incidents of leftism. One of these would be the alphabet minority ('lgbt', etc.) agenda, about which it has been mentioned that Hollywood will always try to shoehorn this into every product, however subtly. This arises, for instance, in the parade, in which pink clothing features prominently, and we are supposed to consider that parades for saying, 'Look at me; I am special' are the exclusive province of those who choose a homosexual lifestyle. As mentioned, Silver is the only ALF member to wear a pink costume at the parade, while also deflecting the Mirando Corporation security staff tranquiliser darts with a 'rainbow' umbrella. We are also prompted to speculate about the nature of the relationship between Blond ('gold') and Silver. Meanwhile, in the opening moments, Lucy is having her make up done by a 'NWE' woman and a man, and we are prompted to consider that, on the whole, it is alphabet minority men who might gravitate towards such a profession.

Of course, leftism is about overturning the established societal order, under the delusion that a fresh slate will allow things to be rebuilt better. While there may be some logic to this, not only will things never improve as long as those faceless Satanists at the apex of the hierarchy, those who own everything and remain untouchable, remain in place, but revolution is also promoted as a way to create discord and distraction, among other things, so that society and surface-level politics remain malleable. As such, leftists work hard only against the prison guards, for the eternal benefit of the prison shareholders, causing misery along the way for their fellow, bottom-rung human beings. As mentioned, youth is a particular target in this respect, with pro-young people and anti-old people agendas a part of the anti-tradition narratives. Meanwhile, free-market capitalism is also a target because it represents independence of every kind, while leftism is sold to the naive as being about helping the poor and vulnerable, in which cause they are told that those who have benefitted from capitalism, being relatively richer than others, are the cause of poverty, as if there were any correlation whatsoever. Unfortunately, false economic models, discredited and merely theoretical, are taught in universities globally, in order to underpin this idea.

Revolution, or 'newness' at any price, crops up when Lucy refers to 'a whole new species' and 'a revolution in the livestock industry', also mentioning that, 'Now, the rotten CEOs are gone. It's Mirando Corporation's new era, with me. And with new core values', while later on, she boasts of visualising new and better ways of doing business, which is all rather supported by Blond's contention that 'Tradition does not make a movement strong', and the ominous overtones in the song lyric, 'When will there be a harvest for the world?'. This picture is complemented in the demonisation of rampant capitalism in the person of Nancy, with the final confrontations in the slaughterhouse making this explicit. Jay asks her to let Okja leave with Mija. Puzzled, Nancy asks why. He says, 'You already have a shitload of money', to which she replies, 'This is business'. She then tells him, 'We're extremely proud of our achievements. We're very hardworking businesspeople. We do deals, and these are the deals we do', all of which falls on deaf ears, of course, since she is such a heartless caricature.

Another minor point is the existence of the Super Pigs themselves. They are a magically real element, and might be accepted as such, but this could bring the veracity of the other Narratives into disrepute, so is bolstered by obfuscation in the hints at bogus 'science'. First, we hear that the first Super Pig was 'miraculously discovered', with a mention of 'scientists [...] observing and performing various studies' a few moments later, as well as referencing 'my top scientists' a minute later. Such pseudo-academic babble is bolstered by Jay's comment about 'the building where Okja was created'. The problem with this is the pretence that the first reproductions could take place

without the presence of both a male and a female, and they never get into any details on this matter; it is all shelved behind a flurry of white coats. One could surmise, firstly, that we are being sold the idea of uniqueness, bolstering the notion that uniqueness is inherently good, as among the different people in a multicultural and alphabet minority society. Secondly, there is the removal of the idea that reproduction involves men, unless it is equated with rape, and thirdly, there is the idea of spontaneous evolution of species, so beloved of the religion of evolution, which is still a part of the war on logic, education, science and spirituality even after two hundred years.

Finally, there is a mystery about the very missable incident, after leaving prison, when Jay puts out Kay's cigarette as a message to stop smoking; one might wonder why this is included, since it seems to have no connection to any of the storyline or Narratives. However, since every incident yields confirmation of its service to the Agenda if one persists with the knowledge that this is so, it is suggested that this is a way of endearing us to the ALF, especially to its ideological apparent leader, Jay. His demonisation as being prone to violence, when he savagely beats Kay, necessary in order to denigrate him as a 'WE' man, needs some repairing, since we are also supposed to engage with his character in its ongoing quest for non-violent sabotage. The problem probably lies with the original script, where it was difficult to find enough fault with him, so the violent outburst needed to be extreme. But this works against the intention to recruit young people to leftist causes through sympathetic characterisation, while love of animals is not enough to cover his outbursts of violence. We also need to be shown his reconciliation with Kay in particular, not only to patch over the flaw in the script, but also in case there is any doubt, because of that, about the inoffensiveness of multiculturalism, so we are being shown that he cares, in fact, for Kay's health and well-being. This repairing of the bridge is also Jay's response to Kay's proffering of the olive branch in rescuing Jay and Mija from Black Chalk, which had previously gone unremarked within the main storyline.

# 8

# Joker

2019

## the storyline

Arthur Fleck lives in Gotham, which is New York City in the DC comic book universe. The story is clearly set in the 1970s, though years are never mentioned. We join the protagonist, Arthur Fleck, while the city is in the middle of a long garbage strike, as the local government is struggling to fund social services, and while everyone is finding it difficult to make ends meet. Arthur works as a freelance clown for an agency, HA-HAs, and we first see him working on a busy sidewalk promoting the closing down sale of Kenny's, a music store, when he is mugged and beaten up by a group of five boys. We next see Arthur at his regular appointment with his social worker, Debra Kane, where we learn that he is taking seven different medications, has spent time in a mental institution, is generally depressed, and is interested in trying to earn a living as a stand-up comedian, keeping a notebook for this purpose. He also has a medical condition which makes him laugh, even when nothing is funny, which we witness happening on a crowded bus going home.

Arthur lives with his mother, Penny, in a dismal apartment building, which is accessed by climbing a very long and steep flight of steps. Penny never goes out, and Arthur looks after her, even helping to bathe her. She asks him to check the mailbox every day because she is expecting a reply from one of her many recent letters to Thomas Wayne, a local millionaire who is running for the office of mayor, to ask him for money because she worked for his family many years before. They watch a show together every evening, 'That's Life', hosted by Murray Franklin. While watching, Arthur fantasises about being in the studio audience and meeting Murray.

At HA-HAs, Randall, a colleague, gives Arthur a gun to protect himself, which he accepts, although he is uncomfortable about it. Arthur is called to the office, where the manager speaks to him about the sign he lost when he was attacked, saying that it will have to be paid for out of his earnings. Arthur is becoming very frustrated and releases his frustration by savagely kicking a garbage bag in an alleyway. In the elevator at home, he meets a neighbour who lives on his floor, Sophie Dumond, a single mother with a daughter, Gigi. They comment on how awful the building is. Penny asks him again about the mail, and also discourages him in his dream of becoming a comedian. Later, Arthur accidentally fires the gun while playing with it in the apartment.

We see Arthur following Sophie while she takes Gigi to school, then travels into the city to work. We next see him in a comedy club, Pogo's, taking notes on the act he is watching, as he laughs at inappropriate times, and does not seem to understand the things that others are finding funny. At home, Sophie knocks to ask Arthur if he was following her, but does not seem bothered by it, and even agrees to come to watch him when he performs at Pogo's.

At one of his clown jobs, Arthur is dancing to a song in a children's ward when his gun falls out of his pocket, after which he is sacked from HA-HAs. On the subway train going home that evening, he witnesses three young city men, a little drunk, harassing a woman, and he starts to laugh due to his medical condition. Quite soon, the men turn their attention to him instead, and end up beating him on the floor, at which point he shoots all of them dead using the gun which Randall had given him, gets off the train and runs away from the station. Running into a public toilet, he immediately begins some slow and idiosyncratic dancing, and calms down completely. We next see him back at his apartment building, marching up to Sophie's door and taking her in his arms as she closes her front door behind them.

At HA-HAs, clearing out his locker, Gary, the office assistant, a dwarf, commiserates with Arthur about losing his job. Arthur speaks to the room about Randall giving him the gun, which Randall denies, and on his way out, Arthur punches the 'punch-out' clock off the wall. back home, Arthur appears to be taking all his medicines erratically, and watches, with Penny, Thomas Wayne being interviewed on television about the subway train killings, because the victims had worked for his company. He also mentions that 'all Wayne employees, past and present: they're family', which encourages Penny in her idea that he will help them financially.

At his next meeting with Debra Kane, Arthur tells her about a song he heard on the radio about someone with the name Carnival, and says this was his clown name at HA-HAs, and connects this to the belief that he is more visible to people than he used to be. He accuses Debra Kane of not listening to him, and she tells him it is their final meeting because the service budget has been cut, telling him that the system does not care about people like him or her.

Arthur is next seen at Pogo's, and before he goes onstage, we see Sophie in the audience. At first, Arthur cannot speak onstage, and simply laughs, due to his condition, to the point of choking, but he is soon underway, although his performance is dismal. We see him afterwards, walking with Sophie in the street. They stop at a newsstand where the headlines mention the clown vigilante. When he reaches home, 'That's Life' is on the television and Penny is asleep. When he rouses her, she tells him there is another of her letters ready for him to mail to Thomas Wayne. When Penny is out of the room, Arthur opens and reads the letter, in which Penny mentions that they had had a love affair, and that Arthur is Thomas Wayne's son. Arthur is angry and shouts at Penny.

Arthur goes on the train to Thomas Wayne's house, and has an interaction with Thomas Wayne's son, Bruce, through the bars of the main gate, until the butler turns up, who, when Arthur mentions Penny, tells him that she was delusional. Arthur grabs the butler by the neck, and is hurting him before suddenly letting go and running off. Arriving home, he finds Penny being put into an ambulance. While sitting outside at the hospital, Arthur is approached by two detectives asking about his gun. In his mother's hospital room, we see Sophie with him. When she leaves to get a coffee, 'That's Life' comes on the television, and Murray Franklin is showing a video recording of Arthur at Pogo's, in order to ridicule him. Back home, Arthur is distracted by a television news report about protestors in the streets wearing clown masks. Apparently, they are protesting against the city's 'elite' and the society which they represent, with Thomas Wayne being a primary focus for their anger. Arthur goes out to see the protests up close, and ends up sneaking past the security of a theatre where he sees Thomas Wayne in the main auditorium. Following him to the bathroom, he confronts him with Penny's assertion that he is his son. Thomas Wayne ends up punching him in the face, and mentions that he was adopted, that Penny is crazy, and that she was arrested and committed to Arkham asylum.

Back at home, Arthur climbs into his refrigerator and closes the door, as a message is being left by the detectives on his telephone answering machine. Later, when a message from the 'That's Life' studio is being left for Arthur on the same machine, he picks up and is invited to appear on the show as one of Murray Franklin's guests, which he accepts. We next see him on the back seat of an empty bus, on his way to Arkham asylum. There, he requests to see, then steals, the file about Penny, and ends up reading through it on the stairwell. This confirms Penny's residence there, her

adoption of Arthur, and the physical violence perpetrated against Arthur and Penny by her 'boyfriend', when Arthur was three years old. It also states that Penny had suffered from 'delusional psychosis and narcissistic personality disorder'

Back at his apartment building, Arthur walks into Sophie's apartment, and walks around intently caressing things in the living room, and is sitting on the sofa as she enters, shocked. She asks him to leave, and we learn that the times where they had been together were all in his imagination. We next see him in hospital giving a speech to Penny before killing her by suffocating her with a pillow, then at home, practising his entrance onstage at the 'That's Life' studio. He rehearses telling a 'knock-knock' joke to Murray Franklin, then taking out his gun and killing himself, which appears to be his plan. We then see him dancing and dying his hair green, and applying his clown make up. It is the day of his appearance on the 'That's Life' show. Picking up a photograph of Penny, he reads a message on the back, apparently written by Thomas Wayne, which would indicate that she had not been delusional about their love affair. The doorbell rings and it is Gary and Randall from HA-HAs, who have come to commiserate with Arthur about the loss of his mother, but for Randall to also ask about what he has said to the police about the gun. Arthur stabs Randall to death and lets Gary leave. On his way to the 'That's Life' studio, we see Arthur dancing down the long steps, in a world of his own, but as he nears the bottom, the two detectives appear at the top, and he runs from them. On the way, he is hit by a car, but makes it onto an elevated train, where many people are wearing clown masks and on their way to a demonstration. The detectives also make it onto the train, and are moving through the cars in pursuit of Arthur when they end up in a struggle with some passengers and end up being severely beaten.

At the 'That's Life' studio, Murray Franklin visits Arthur's dressing room, where Arthur asks to be introduced as 'Joker'. He enters the stage as the third and final guest, and his interview with Murray Franklin immediately becomes distasteful to the audience. Arthur reveals his dislike for the way people have always treated him, and for Murray Franklin because he had ridiculed him with the recording from Pogo's. He also confesses to the subway train killings. When he gets to the point of telling his 'knock-knock' joke, he pulls out his gun and shoots Murray Franklin dead, live on air. The television stations and the rioters in the streets go wild with this story, and the mayhem is witnessed by Arthur from the squad car which is taking him to the police department. The car is hit by an ambulance, leaving the police officer at the wheel dead or unconscious, while the protestors remove Arthur from the car and lay him on the hood. We see Thomas Wayne with his wife emerge from a theatre and shot dead in front of their son in an alleyway by a mask-wearing protestor, as Arthur wakes and stands up on the squad car, cheered by an ecstatic crowd.

In hospital, presumably Arkham, we see Arthur in handcuffs, laughing, being interviewed by a psychiatrist. She asks him what is funny and he says that she would not get the joke, then sings the 'That's Life' theme song.

## Narrative 1: evil capitalism

This movie is a unification of three main, unsurprising Narratives, which appear to be equally balanced and interdependent. The demonisation of capitalism, or free-market economies, provides the main context for the storyline, along with the usual, ubiquitous presence of the other Narratives regarding race and gender. In this, the context makes good use of distractors which appear to play bilaterally, in order to push the trojan horse of this Narrative through, such that the foot soldiers in this case act as cover for the horse, rather than the other way around. The trojan horse of the anti-capitalist narrative, which is to say, also, anything anti-rightist or anti-conservative, reaches its target mainly by using the portrayal of people's everyday financial difficulties, being at the mercy of those faceless, dastardly capitalists who could presumably improve the situation were it not for their own greed. This is a socialist commentary, a big-time onslaught on the evils of capitalism and those who

selfishly exploit it for their personal gain, and the way this was or is perpetually facilitated by supposedly outdated systems which serve only to benefit those few at the expense of the vast majority.

Capitalism is evident in the fact that practically everyone appears to be working for a living, because if they did not, extreme poverty and starvation would presumably be the alternative. This is shown in the person of the protagonist, Arthur, who seems to need to hold down a job despite being mentally unwell and taking many medications. While his mother could be assumed to be receiving state benefits, this is not mentioned, while we are also told how the social services budgets are being cut, creating difficulties for those who will be made redundant, like Arthur's social worker, Debra Kane. Presumably, the loss of employment for her is a signifier for the fate of those who do not unionise or collectivise, in what is assumed to be the prerogative only of socialism, although this is unstated except for the reality of the garbage strike. As Debra Kane tells him, 'They don't give a shit about people like you, Arthur', thus showing that vulnerable people are neglected under such a system. While she does not state who 'they' are, we are to assume that it includes all those in national and local government who pay lip service to their responsibility for the taxpayers' welfare. We also hear about businesses struggling, as with Kenny's music store, for whom Arthur is working at the start, and when Arthur is told that he will have to pay for the cost of the lost sign he was twirling at Kenny's, then that he is losing his job, he is made more depressed mainly because of the financial difficulties he will be facing as a result. Meanwhile, Arthur's neighbour, Sophie, is holding down a job in a bank while also looking after her daughter, which must be a struggle she would prefer to do without. Street prostitutes are also in evidence, as seen in the background, for example, when Arthur is being fired while speaking to his boss from a phone booth, to show that people are doing anything they can to make a living, while the opening remarks on the radio mention that 'The building industry and landlords today expressed concern over the latest increase in heating oil prices', so that, 'Renters in the metro area are certain to feel the pinch'.

However, the main way of showing, visually, thematically, and appropriately, how capitalism has failed the nation and the city is the garbage strike. This is covered in the opening scene as a radio news report on day 18 of the strike. With 10,000 tons of garbage accumulating every day, this means there are now 180,000 tons of garbage on the city's streets, which we are shown in a number of scenes. And the effects are extreme because rats, as well as an effect on businesses, are mentioned. When Arthur is taking his frustration out on a garbage bag by savagely kicking it, after he has been doubly victimised by having to pay for the sign destroyed by his juvenile attackers, this is not only a way of drawing our attention to the garbage, but also shows us, in terms of the storyline, the citizens' anger about it, which represents all the difficulties they are facing, and that they will be looking to take out their anger on those deemed responsible. When the garbage bags are beaten by Arthur, they are being personified, such that the garbage can symbolically represent those responsible. Not only this, but rats, a result of the accumulated garbage, are mentioned three times. As one newsreader puts it, 'Authorities are saying the city is under siege by scores of rats. And not just any rats: super rats, who are hard to kill'. Rats 'who are hard to kill' is an even less abstract identification of those responsible for the garbage, with the emphasis here on 'kill', which echoes with the later calls to 'kill the rich'.

And the garbage problem itself is an appropriate way to represent the supposed failure of capitalism, which is being meshed with the race and gender Narratives, since those blamed for it are clearly shown to be only 'WE' men, particularly the rich ones who have succeeded in this system. We are being sold a highly perverted version of the world as it had been made by 'WE' societies, degenerating and on its last legs by the 1970s. We are to consider, presumably, that the implementation of laws which increased the equality of opportunity for all citizens rendered these systems unworkable, since it had become more difficult to exploit and steal from large numbers of people, resulting in a broken, anachronistic system. Furthermore, the fact that this revolves around a strike is highly significant, since we are to presume that the garbage workers, in an expression of true socialist values and methods, have used the collective of their unions to ask for a wage increase, which is presumably due to the impossible cost of living. As Penny tells Arthur, regarding



Thomas Wayne, 'If he knew how we were living, if he saw this place, it would make him sick', to which Arthur replies, from his dreamer's perspective, 'I don't want you to worry about money'. Thus, the effects of an extremist capitalist ideology are shown at a level at which the lives of most people are being affected. We are also to assume that the strike motif has been very deliberately chosen as a storyline context because the usual "WE" man: bad' narrative could have been deployed in any number of ways.

In addition, there are Depression-era references, a telling nod to the 1929 engineered stock market crash, showcased in the excerpt from the Chaplin movie, 'Modern Times' (1936). Chaplin, of course, is the movie clown whose character was that of a homeless vagrant during the Depression, and something of this persists in the costumes of the HA-HAs clowns, with fake patches applied to their pants. More of this flavour is added with the inclusion of the Chaplin song, 'Smile' (1954), the musical movie clip from 'Shall We Dance' (1937), the piano being played outside the music store next to Arthur when he gets mugged, and the song 'The Moon Is a Silver Dollar Shining Up in the Sky' (Lawrence Welk, 1939), which has a distinctive recording sound from that era, as well as the mention of unattainable cash. We might also note that, during Arthur's rampage against the garbage bag, the Ferris wheel in the background is not turning. Not only does this mean that no business or enjoyment seems to be occurring in Gotham City's equivalent of Coney Island, but could also signify that the world, with its natural cycles of sowing and reaping, seems to have come to a standstill. As if he were alone in the world, isolated in his circumstances, as everyone else seems to be, no people are seen to pass by on the street beyond the alleyway; only a train passes, above a burned out, abandoned car. Finally, there is a great deal of grittiness, dirt and graffiti in evidence, to show that the Gotham citizens suffer from despair and a lack of self-respect which long predated and foreshadowed the garbage strike. All of this serves to place us as much in the late 1930s as the late 1970s, as if to say, to the people of Gotham, as well as to the audience of today, that a reckoning, or a righteous war, is coming.

Interestingly, however, there is little homelessness in Gotham. The closest we come to this are the couple of people sitting on the sidewalk as Arthur is running from the two detectives, and the fleeting images of men at night standing around their oil-drum, street fires immediately after the subway train killings, as Arthur races past again. More widespread homelessness appears conspicuous by its absence. It can be speculated, though, that this acts as a restraint on the impression of complete societal collapse, showing that the citizens still have something to lose, as if they are anticipating the final straw. We are witnessing the moments prior to that final collapse, when the tension is greatest and the financial strain is felt most, since we are to presume that people are holding on to jobs and accommodation by the skin of their teeth. Furthermore, it is not those who have anything left to lose who are most likely to collaborate in an uprising, but those who are next-closest to that circumstance. Interestingly, the city's asylum continues to operate even in the midst of this supposedly capitalist dystopia. While necessary for the storyline, since Arkham is integral to the Gotham universe, it also works to portray state oppression through incarceration, as well as the idea, not least because of its enormous size, that many people are being driven insane by living in this dysfunctional society; it is another symptom of the extent of the inability of such a system to function.

The free market economy is presented as being the choice, and to the advantage of, the wealthy and powerful minority, with no advantage to the average citizen. It is presented as the way in which certain people can become rich by exploiting the majority, even as if this were a kind of theft, and as if there were a limited amount of wealth to be created or managed. The fallacy presented on the other side, meanwhile, pretends, without devolving into any detail whatsoever, that taking the wealth from the wealthy, through targeted taxation or some more unlawful method, would resolve the issue of poverty, while also serving to enact justifiable revenge against those who have been living like kings under a free market system, even as if that, too, might be a solution. This is expressed in Arthur's statement to Murray Franklin, and imitated by the killer of Thomas Wayne and his wife, that 'You get what you fucking deserve'. As can be seen in the portrayal here, since only extremes are shown, and since there is no middle ground, along with the pretence that none of the created wealth

is reinvested in society due to the voracious and selfish nature of those who own the wealth and the power, we inevitably empathise with the plight of the working and unemployed poor. Since we are only being shown what pretends to be a capitalist system, with elements we might think we recognise from our own experience, we are the targets of an evangelical crusade, only able to sympathise with the anti-rich sentiments of the despairing or riotous mobs in Gotham, carried along on the tide of hate for an 'other' class of people. In being a more directly political message, a 'Battleship Potemkin' (1925) of our times, complete with its own flight of steps, this qualifies more as classic propaganda than other Narratives we have considered, which are more correctly classified as social engineering propaganda.

Such rabble-rousing always comes with its sloganeering, and the riot scenes provide a flavour of the socialist nature of this uprising, with placards reading, 'GREED [loves] CAPITALISM', 'A JOB IS A RIGHT', and 'KILL THE RICH'. This is also focussed on the political class in particular, with, 'CLOWN for MAYOR', 'FUCK WAYNE', and 'WAYNE = FASCIST'. This echoes another sign saying, 'PIGS are fascist', appearing in the scene when the two detectives are savagely attacked, a text to accompany the visual instruction to the audience. As in the real world, this particular accusation is being hurled about by socialists who do not know what it means, and who are the true proponents of fascism. These sentiments are picked up by the media, since we have the newspaper headline, 'KILL THE RICH / A NEW MOVEMENT?', and a protester in the street being interviewed, who, in response to the question, 'What's the point of all this?', replies, 'Fuck the rich. Fuck Thomas Wayne. That's what this whole fucking thing is about. Fuck the whole system', which neatly accounts for much of the ostensible thesis of the movie. Meanwhile, the presenter interviewing Thomas Wayne, after the subway train killings, mentions a 'groundswell of anti-rich sentiment in the city', adding, 'It's almost as if our less fortunate residents are taking the side of the killer'. Finally, there is another sign which has been added to the mix here, but as part of the more subtle layer of coding. In the second scene, at Kenny's music store, it is the one being twirled by Arthur, and hanging in the store window, saying 'EVERYTHING MUST GO!!'. This is a neat disclosure, at the outset, of the trajectory of the movie, telling us that the societal norms of that era, which are being suggested as a parallel of our own, no longer serve any useful purpose, and need to be replaced. It is also a rallying cry, in this respect, inviting the audience to consider that participating in a violent uprising, as exemplified by the rioters in the penultimate scene, might be justifiable.

This is all a tragic misdirection because we suffer not as a direct consequence of the existence of the wealthy, or even of the surface-political class, but as a result of larger forces, of banking and covert influences on industry, regime policy, and military interests, dictating economic policy at a global and covert level, in a system where the individual puppets managing the regimes are prevented, through vested interests, threats and blackmail, from improving anything. In Gotham, as in the real world, we are shown only those operating on the surface of that world, the surface-politicians and businesspeople, as if they were not being managed by unseen and unnamed others with an Agenda which supersedes any national or short-term one. Those who believe our perennial difficulties to be due to mere incompetence or innate selfishness, therefore, continue to rail against the sociopathology of the system's immediate and very temporary representatives, presented to them by the propaganda networks, much as we are being encouraged to continue doing through the examples set by Arthur and the citizens of Gotham.

What works well here is the exploitation of the audience's awareness that there is practically nothing right about the way our world is run, and that this is largely due to the interests and corruption mentioned. Such dysfunctionality is thus easily transposed from 1970s Gotham onto present day reality, with the similarly-transposed fictional causes and solutions being showcased in a fictional time and place. One example of the dysfunctionality which goes beyond surface-level 'politics' in the real world, and which can be clearly seen in Gotham, is the absurdity of the electoral system, to which the misnomer 'democracy' is applied. This rigged game serves to dupe the majority of the people on the planet into going along with the status quo, as if there were no other way to arrange things, while the belief in its efficacy, despite all evidence to the contrary, enjoys the unchallengeable status of a global, majority religion. The audience would also recognise the domination of surface

level politics by non-young, 'WE' men, also easily mapped from 70s Gotham to present day reality. This would be a fair point to make, but it cannot be concluded that there is anything wrong with this, or that these administrative jobs do not serve citizens well because of who is doing the job; this cannot be attributed to race or gender. Obviously, if there were anything which should be changed about that scam, it would be to use a system of merit, in selecting the bureaucrats who are supposed to manage our countries, instead of ensuring, instead, that the ability and the right to do this job depends entirely upon the amount of money somebody has, or on their personal connections. Furthermore, in the age of relatively advanced technology, at least in comparison to those 1970s, it still appears to be way too much to expect that the citizens of a country might be asked to vote on the action to be taken on any issue; even one issue would be a start. (Oh, yes, one could almost forget: there was the so-called 'brexit', among a number of other ignored referenda in the 'European Union', the result of which was ignored for three years, then compromised into oblivion; nice, however, as an illusion for those who remain unable to face, just yet, any of the truths about our world.)

In presenting the debate as an us-and-them dichotomy, we are being left without a choice about whom to sympathise with, as there are no redeeming features applied to Thomas Wayne. As members of the slave class in the real world, most of us are victims of corruption, mismanagement, physical threat and outright theft by any of the regimes we live under, even if we choose to ignore this for the sake of a quiet life and what crumbs we might manage to scavenge to exist on. Because we have also been led to believe that we live in free-market democracies, we can easily recognise our own plight in that of Gotham, and be further led to consider the ways in which it mirrors our own societies, or how our own trajectory might even follow that of its degeneration into revolution. We feel we have heard the same words before when Thomas Wayne says of the protestors, 'There's something wrong with those people', and the biting obscenities, 'I'm here to help them. I'm going to lift them out of poverty, help make their lives better [...]. They may not realise it, but I'm their only hope'. Any credibility which Thomas Wayne might have as a politician is also diminished in Penny's praise of him, because of her poor judgement and history of delusion. Indeed, the intention is that the audience have no doubt about how terrible Thomas Wayne and the system he seeks to perpetuate are, in order that they would support any effort to overturn it. This resonates clearly with our understanding that the wheels of full-blown socialism are always set in motion by revolt, even though this is, ironically, always the result of manipulation by those who are capitalists to a psychopathic degree, and a clear example of how leftism is simply their favourite pawn.

Thus, although there are differences between our world and the historical, fictitious Gotham, we live, nevertheless, in an 'us and them' world, and the intention of this movie is to awaken us to such a level of political and social awareness, while pushed to the limits of our support for the people of Gotham's rights to resist the wrongs of the regime. The surface-political elite, are always, tellingly, hung out to dry more readily than are the banking elite, and they are portrayed as a class very much apart. When the radio presenter in the opening scene mentions that the garbage strike 'affects almost everyone in the city, no matter who they are or where they live', the word 'almost' is key, and we are later shown, in the unruffled screening of the Chaplin movie at Wayne Hall, that the very wealthy are unaffected by the strike, even as the rioters are clamouring at the front door; they are inside laughing while the citizens are shouting for blood just metres away. In that same radio item, when a member of the public is heard to say, 'Put them in a room, let them sit there and talk till they get it over with', the key word is 'them'. Such people are also characterised by Arthur when he finally confronts Thomas Wayne, accusing him of being rude, cold, and indecent, before asking, 'What is it with you people!'. The great divide is also pointed out by Arthur on the 'That's Life' show. Speaking of the three men he killed, he asks, 'Why is everybody so upset about these guys?', and quite rightly states that, 'If it was me dying on the sidewalk, you'd walk right over me', then makes the link to the unspoken reason, saying, 'Because Thomas Wayne cried about them on t.v.'. This perception is also evident in Arthur's general awareness, even though he is politically illiterate, since he starts a joke, on stage at Pogo's, with, 'Why are the rich people so...?'

When it comes to the subway killings themselves, we are being asked, in fact, just as we were with the 'Death Wish' (1974-1994) movies, a very leading question about whether we support the actions of the vigilante acting in self defence in a perennially broken system. The difference between Arthur and 'Death Wish's' Paul Kersey, however, is the identity of the aggressor against whom one is defending oneself; these are not mere hoodlums that Arthur justifiably kills in self defence, but employees of Thomas Wayne, fully demonised by all contemporary Narrative standards, so it is small wonder that many of the citizens perceive the killings as an intentional token of protest, and take this as an invitation to scale it up into a full-blown riot and aspiring revolution, and that the motif of the clown mask is instantly widely adopted. It is also little wonder that we are also supportive of Arthur's act, and in this way are being made to feel like a member of the gathering protestors. Once we are at that point, we are probably with Arthur and the crowds all the way, in the rioting, the utter contempt for the police and the regime, in the desire to change the status quo of Gotham's regime (and our own), and to have some sympathy or understanding for Arthur when he kills Randall, Penny and Murray Franklin. This is quite a long way to try to drag us, ideologically, the thesis being a deliberately incendiary one, and we should consider Arthur's place in this, the protagonist with whom we are brought to empathise. He has no political awareness, understanding or agenda, traits which are mirrored in the majority of the movie's audience. This is one of the reasons why the audience can empathise with him, travelling with him all the way; he does not need to think about the social implications of what he does, but can still have desirable effects. It is as if the movie was produced to function as a recruitment for extremist, leftist activists, with the option of not needing to understand anything politically in order to contribute to the worthy cause; for such people, the slogans are enough, the demonisation of somebody, anybody, without reason, is enough.

The position of the elite, political class, meanwhile, and the way it is communicated, is also familiar to us. The mainstream media conspire to close ranks with that class, and provide them with a platform denied to everyone else. Thomas Wayne is thus shown being 'interviewed' on television with scripted questions, following the subway train killings. When the presenter mentions that the citizens seem to be supportive of the killer, Thomas Wayne expresses the extent of his delusion about the way things stand, and his disconnection from the people, first in a display of regret, saying that this is 'a shame', only meaning that such feeling works against his own interests. He then predictably turns this to his personal, political advantage, with 'It's one of the reasons I'm considering running for mayor. But when he adds, 'Gotham's lost its way', he steps over the line of acceptability by insinuating that the people are confused and mistaken, and that he stands above them, being wise enough to lead them, like a shepherd directing sheep. He then proceeds to insult our heroes, calling them cowardly and cold-blooded, before pushing into a full-blown caricature of a wealthy capitalist, accusing the killer of being 'someone who is envious of those more fortunate than themselves', and adding, 'Until those kind of people change for the better, those of us who made something of our lives will always look at those who haven't as nothing but clowns'. When Arthur laughs at this, and is told by Penny that 'It's not funny', we are being told that it is, in fact, supposed to be funny; it is intended to be a pastiche of such opinion and such people, and we are supposed to despise Thomas Wayne and the television station for this kind of insulting insincerity, the opposite of what is intended by such obscenity in the real world; it is supposed to be obvious enough for us to recognise it as pastiche, and then to recognise that this is how we are insulted in the real world, and then to act upon it. It is another way that our real-world experience or awareness is being exploited, and another way of justifying an uprising against it.

Noticeably, we are not provided here with any details of the strike or the strikers. We are not shown the extent to which such a strike would promote or depend on mutual support or camaraderie among the workers, since the presence of such an element would introduce an element of humanity and warmth to the recipe, which as we know would be a contradiction of the tacit aims of Hollywood, whose products all seek to depress and negate rather than to inspire or enlighten; no positivity is allowed, especially in Arthur's Gotham, because this time and place needs to be portrayed as hopeless and despairing, with all positivity expunged as a result of the damaging, self-serving policies followed by its regime. Besides, one of the main motifs here is that of individual isolation, such being a contributing factor in the societal breakdown, and thereby championing collectivisation,

as exemplified in the only place it appears: the rioting. The individual isolation is apparent in the way that nobody seems to interact, even when they are together. The nearest we might get to this is when Arthur speaks to Penny, to Thomas Wayne's butler, or to Murray Franklin, or when Sophie mentions something to Arthur in the elevator about their building, but there are many more instances when separation is clearly the dominant motif; together but not together. Most often, there is the way in which nobody faces each other, as shown in the theatre, the cinema, the 'That's Life' studio, the bus, and the suburban train. Elsewhere, there is the elevator in Arkham, when Arthur is one of four people not interacting, all facing the doors, and when Arthur watches television with Penny; as is the way with all shows, people focus on the medium, and not each other. Furthermore, the fact that the commuters on the suburban train are all consuming the same two newspapers is very similar to watching the same thing in a cinema, together, but separately. On the subway trains, because nobody speaks to anybody else, we do not know if any of them are together. Finally, there is the bus which Arthur takes to Arkham, when he sits on the centre of the rear seat, apparently the only passenger, taking the express to the abyss which will complete him.

This societal estrangement, and the clear division between the classes, is pointed out by Arthur on 'That's Life' when he tells Murray Franklin, 'Nobody's civil anymore. Nobody thinks what it's like to be the other guy. You think men like Thomas Wayne ever think what it's like to be someone like me; to be somebody but themselves? They don't'. He also tells Murray Franklin that he has 'nothing left to lose. Nothing can hurt me any more', and, 'I killed those guys because they were awful. Everybody is awful these days. It's enough to make anyone crazy'. Again, since we know, as Murray Franklin does not, what he has been through, this serves as an apologetic to cushion the shock of his killing of Murray Franklin. To push the point home, leading up to the punchline, he asks, 'What do you get when you cross a mentally ill loner with a society that abandons him and treats him like trash?'. His societal and social circumstances are also aptly illustrated when he walks into a glass exit door at the hospital. While this neatly references slapstick, humour, as well as the foolishness of the 'WE' man, it also encapsulates the feeling we can easily have of having to work against the tide to merely survive, while certain others flow easily with the current. Most significantly, it references the prescribed limits of our individual opportunity in the established system. Since this movie aims to allude to the evils of capitalism, which promotes individualism and the idea that opportunity can be created, the inclusion of the glass door is way of showing that such liberty is an illusion, and that it has been provided in order to keep us buying into a false paradigm of striving to better our material security while the elite abscond with diamonds as big as the Ritz.

## Narrative 2: race (and gender)

Capitalism, then, is not working in 1970s Gotham, and this would be, according to the movie's producers, either because there is something inherently wrong with it, or because it is being managed entirely by 'WE' men, although both are intentionally joined at the hip, here, their evils mutually supportive. Also inextricably tied are the narratives of race and gender, in the demonisation of 'WE' men, although this is no surprise, being the Hollywood Narrative common to every single product. This appears to be even more the case here, however, since 'WE' women are largely absent, from either demonisation or lionisation, so that one of the impressions we are to get is that this is a society heavily dominated not only by 'WE' people, but by 'WE' people who are male. Thus, Penny becomes the sole representative of 'WE' women. As a 'WE' person, she needs to be denigrated, although this does not lapse into demonisation, because she is a woman, is largely a victim character, and lionisation is largely absent from this movie, which imbues it with an unusually dispiriting atmosphere. The closest we get to finding a hero in this is in Arthur, simply because he manages to shrug off the shackles of the oppressive system, releasing himself by killing without conscience, because he has been damaged and hurt as much as it is possible to be. While we might have some sympathy for his plight, and even cheer his killing of the three men on the subway train, he is entirely unlikeable. This is a recipe very carefully balanced, with a risk being taken by posting

the 'WE' man as the hero. This is why he has to be shown to achieve the desired ends of inciting an uprising without knowing anything at all about what is happening. For him, there are no ideals; there is only his personal, selfish experience of the world, and all the 'awful' people in it.

As a 'WE' man, Arthur fits a common type as that of defenceless victim and loser, as seen in the attack by the five boys. One of them actually tells us exactly what we are to think of 'WE' men, saying, 'Come on, this guy's weak. He can't do nothing. Beat him up. Take his stuff'. This passivity is especially evident when contrasted with the successful 'WE' men featured, but because Arthur is a 'WE' man, when he is provoked beyond endurance, to retaliate, he is flawed in being prone to overreaction. This is all one with his apparent mental state, which includes delusion, although the audience is surely being played with this point, because there seems to be little imaginary about some of what Arthur suffers, at the hands of the state and individuals, along with everyone else. His suffering needs to be doubly qualified, therefore, by showing us the extent to which he can imagine events, through his imaginary relationship with Sophie. This might invite us to question, therefore, whether any of the other attacks he has suffered actually happened, such that even his subway train victims may not have attacked him. Again, this is left somewhat open, allowing for different expediencies, although we are predisposed to believe in the evil behaviour of those three men, regardless, because they are 'WE' and 'privileged'. Arthur's mental illness, particularly his own 'WE' form of this, is shown to be a dangerous weakness because he is prone to violence. His reaction to losing the money for the stolen sign results in his attack on the garbage bag, and when he is fired from HA-HAs, cracks the glass of the telephone booth with his head. He also tries to strangle Thomas Wayne's butler, and kills his mother, apparently remorselessly, finishing off the job which Thomas Wayne had carelessly started decades before. Arthur is also reckless enough to also plan to kill himself or Murray Franklin on live television, so we are being provided with the other side of the Thomas Wayne coin: as a 'WE' man, Arthur is similarly self-serving or narcissistic, congenitally psychopathic, and very importantly, has delusions of grandeur and entitlement, despite possessing no particular talents. The final moments of the movie show him dancing, apparently blissfully, in a corridor at the mental institution, having left a trail of blood, apparently, on the floor with his footprints, an obscure way of referring to the murder and mayhem which 'WE' men are presumed to leave in their wake, wherever they go and whatever they do. At this point, Arthur is wearing the asylum's uniform, all-white, which is one of Hollywood's less-than-subtle methods which it sometimes uses to signify 'WE'-ness.

Arthur's idiosyncratic dancing, furthermore, is intended to be an expression of his derangement, but also signposts the moments when he is feeling most liberated, or most like himself. This dancing is something he discovers minutes after he has killed the three men on the subway train, telling us that this act has freed him, allowing him to finally revert to his true nature, and the shock of the attack and the killings immediately dissipates. The dance can also be categorised as 'performance', though, and shows again that he lives in a fantasy world in which he imagines himself as the performer, identifying to an unhealthy extent with the false, television world, and unable to resist being affected by it. After all, if Arthur cannot feel as if he himself exists, this can combine with his relationship with the television world to produce dangerously psychopathic behaviour.

Arthur also plays the part of the creepy stalker and sexual predator, which also feeds into a tabloid notion of the dangerous loner, who is always a 'WE' man. Furthermore, the inclusion of the Chaplin references are intended to mirror some aspects of Arthur's character, since he was also a comedian and a 'WE', penniless loner. Meanwhile, the characterisation of Arthur as dangerous is shown when he is following Sophie as she drops Gigi at school, and then to where she works, while also imagining himself entering her apartment to have sex with her, and then actually entering her apartment and sitting in the living room while she is putting Gigi to bed in the next room. His interaction with a child on the bus is also considered inappropriate by the mother, who scolds him loudly. And when Arthur tears a Wayne family photograph from the newspaper and puts it into his notebook, this is intended to be menacing; a danger to the everyday citizen and their children, a perspective soon confirmed by Arthur's odd encounter with Thomas Wayne's young son. This is all compounded, rather than otherwise, by the fact that his disturbed mental state is also due to his

childhood experiences at the hands of the mentally ill and incompetent 'WE' Penny, his adopted mother, and the physical abuse suffered because of her 'boyfriend'. We are not given the name or race of the 'boyfriend', so we cannot draw the conclusion, only presume, partly by guessing the approximate time period, that he was 'WE'. Certainly, any mental damage done to Arthur as a result of these childhood experiences, augmented by his presumed, racially congenital deficiencies, can be attributed, at the very least, to his 'WE'-ness as well as his male-ness.

Although one of the reasons Arthur is easily condemned is his sociopathological nature, ultimately, it is his self-interested actions, in the subway train killings and that of Murray Franklin, which spark the conflagration of widespread destruction and societal disruption, as well as the further deaths of Thomas Wayne and his wife, almost as if the cocktail of the existence and actions of the two 'WE' men, Thomas Wayne and Arthur, was always bound to be a lethal one in Gotham, the microcosm of the 'WE' world. Because this uprising occurs despite Arthur's being entirely removed from any political awareness, this supports the now-common Hollywood notion that 'WE' people are evil congenitally, so that not only does everything they are involved in become harmful, but also that they can be entirely unaware of the extreme dangers they can easily present by virtue of their mere existence. If we lived in a different universe, Arthur's circumstances might be portrayed sympathetically, endearing us somewhat to the character and providing evidence of strengths he has mustered in overcoming adversity. Obviously, that can never happen in Hollywood; Arthur's circumstances are not portrayed for any reason besides that of the compulsory castigation of 'WE' men. For instance, we are prevented from considering that the glorious outcome of the uprising is truly Arthur's doing because he is an unwitting catalyst; all the real work is being carried out by the other citizens of Gotham, those who are 'without race' behind the masks and makeup.

Thomas Wayne, in being a prominent public figure, a very wealthy businessman who is going into politics, tends to be the focus of anger for the irate citizenry, and is intended to represent the entirety of his class; the only other time such people are on display is in the theatre watching the Chaplin movie during the riots. Therefore, Thomas Wayne is the one face we are shown of this class, who are supposed to remain otherwise in the shadows, presumably because they live out their lives of luxury and power at some distance from the unwashed masses, as shown by the appearance of Thomas Wayne's house, beyond the outer gate of which Arthur, and the citizenry he represents, cannot penetrate. Even moreso than Thomas Wayne's butler at the gate, Thomas Wayne himself is shown to be callous in his encounter with Arthur at the theatre, when he denies having had any relationship with Arthur's mother, something shown soon after to have been false, based on the message written on the rear of a photograph of her, even though, in the way of such complexity, we are left guessing; perhaps Penny had written this herself. But the inclusion of this is necessary in order to also suggest that Thomas Wayne takes advantage of people, particularly women, and thereafter discards them, such that he might, after all, be Arthur's father. He is also shown to be blind to the plight of the citizens, since he professes to be able to resolve Gotham's problems by going into politics on their behalf, as if perpetuating the existing system could play a part in any of the solutions.

We are supposed to read Thomas Wayne's comments in the television interview as more callous mendacity and deceit, or as a blindness to the inherent problems with the status quo of the current system. It is also important to show that Thomas Wayne is a type, part of a class, rather than being alone in his domination of Gotham, which is why the moments in the packed theatre are included, with almost every seat occupied by a 'WE' person; men like Thomas Wayne, and their wives, with one 'NWE' woman prominently placed on the aisle as a mask. This is an image of the 'WE' army arrayed against us, and they are laughing at, rather than with, the fictitious, on-screen antics of a victim of the system they willingly perpetuate. Incidentally, there is something very odd - incongruous - about the fact that they are watching a silent movie from 40 years earlier, and we can surmise that this is not merely an expedient way to allude to the idea of the clown, Chaplin, the 'WE' male, but also another way of linking the 1930s to the 1970s, in order to show, since the audience are evidently enjoying the movie, that the mindset of those times, the blindness to the plight of others, prevails among their class, that they actually 'live in the past', and that their cherished system is a long-lived

and entrenched one. The privilege which such people are presumed to expect is aptly summed up in an entirely different movie from that time, a comedy, 'Being There' (1979), in which a 'NWE' woman, recognising a 'WE' man she knows well being consulted on television concerning serious national issues, even though he is an illiterate moron, states, 'It's for sure a white man's world in America [...]. All you got to be is white in America, to get whatever you want'. This is a tongue-in-cheek comment from a comedy, but such an idea is now being literally propagated much more seriously and vigorously in Hollywood, in every single product.

One common complexity of this Narrative is the masking of the message, which is achieved here by the inclusion of other 'WE' men, which are also worth considering. These are also workers, some of them being comedians, unable to take the world seriously, and as if they were, like the ruling class, willfully ignoring life's difficulties. And this would include the television show host, Murray Franklin, not least because he tells the occasional joke as part of his show. One of the Pogo's comedians manages to shoehorn another talking point into the few moments of his appearance. He follows a joke about his wife with the comment, 'I can't use my real last name at this college because they don't hire Jews', at which everyone laughs, as if this were a self-evident truth. The idea, however, that qualified Jewish professors have ever experienced any difficulty in gaining tenure within academia would be the real joke here, of course, but this is included as a contribution to a common conflation of Jewishness with race or ethnicity, not least in order to support the bizarre notion that 'WE' people are particularly 'racist', since that seems to strike a chord with people, and even though those who identify as being Jewish are practically all 'WE' people. The inclusion of this comment seems indulgent, and may be included to refer to the glass ceilings faced by practically everyone outside the elitist few. Also, it is because the category of 'WE' men is being subdivided which allows us to place the race Narrative after that of the evil capitalism Narrative, in terms of what is being prioritised.

Another instance of the portrayal of 'WE' men of 'privilege' occurs when Arthur is riding the train to Thomas Wayne's house. Every seat in his train car is occupied, and this being an afternoon commuter train, it is full of people returning home after a day in the office, which is, by the looks of the passengers, secure and lucrative employment. Every single person is a 'WE' man, so they are shown not only to have enjoyed advantages which primed them for application to their jobs, but also presumably been given preferential treatment during the hiring process. Not only this, but they are shown to prefer living outside the city, away from the unwashed masses, aspiring Thomas Waynes all. They are also implicitly shown to be adherents to the status quo of the system, as dictated by the Gotham regime's propaganda, because they are all reading newspapers, another 'black and white' medium which panders to their shared-unshared reality.

Murray Franklin is another type, a working man who has succeeded as the HA-HAs clowns never will. He is a beneficiary, apparently, of his privilege as a 'WE' man in this 'WE' men's world, and has fallen into his role without question, along with the other television presenters, comfortable with it as one might be with something which had always appeared as one's birthright. As such, like all the successful 'WE' men we glimpse in this movie, Murray Franklin is wearing a target; he is deserving of some kind of retribution in the name of 'social justice', as understood from a perspective crudely cultivated decades after the era depicted. Most of all, being part of the media, which works hand-in-glove with politicians, Murray Franklin and his type display extreme insincerity; everything they say is scripted, as we see from the cue cards facing him in the studio; nothing they say can be taken as being honest or true. This comes across in the inability to discuss anything seriously or honestly, as with the comedians at Pogo's, while Murray Franklin's comments are glib and shallow, and the audience is to be distracted into believing that something worthy of attention is being provided for them because of all the music and glitter. At first glance, this would appear to be as much as to agree with the premise of this book. However, that which is an evident truth concerning the state-run, propaganda media deployed by our regimes, being recognised as such by the audience of this movie, as being true in the real world, is, instead, entirely aligned with the usual Narratives, while even serving to whitewash the revelation further by consigning it to fiction or to history. We are hardly regretful, therefore, when Murray Franklin is killed by Arthur, or when Thomas Wayne is killed



that same evening, since they have been set up as establishment figures which serve to maintain the status quo, while Arthur is being 'run' in parallel to all of this as a pretence that this is, instead, his story.

Regarding the three subway train victims, they represent the thesis in microcosm. being 'WE' men, they are portrayed as privileged, because of their appearance as workers in the financial district, and as nasty, dangerous and cowardly, because of their harassment of the woman in the train and their attack on Arthur. They would also, no doubt, be found to be entirely blind to the plight of any of their fellow citizens. This makes them deserving of retribution, and this is provided within moments by Arthur, also allowing for them to be shown, after all their bravado, to be weak and easily defeated; it is suddenly open season on such men, for the movie's audience as much as for Arthur and the people of Gotham. This also gives a chance for Thomas Wayne to appear on television, closing ranks with other 'WE' men, to spout some mendacious nonsense about the victims being 'good, decent, educated'. This scene, however, does provide some further texture in terms of the fictionalised way society is presumed to have looked at the time, in the advertisements on the walls of the train car. These all seem to be for the same company and product, the fictitious 'Stripe N' Stick'. One of these shows 'WE' men in football and business clothing. Another has a silhouette of two 'cowboys' in the hills. A third has a 'WE' couple posing for the camera in sportswear, with the man in a relatively dominant position, and a fourth shows two 'WE' people jogging.

The two detectives, meanwhile, are similarly shown to be easily taken down, deemed targets by the crowd due to their status as police officers, since they not only represent, uphold and defend the 'WE' establishment, but are also 'WE' men who, no doubt, acquired their secure positions because of the same notional 'privilege' already mentioned. Furthermore, the attack on the police officers is another significant event which occurs as a result of Arthur's unwitting influence on events; his innate toxicity. More privately, there is the killing of Randall, whose only apparent crime was to own a gun and give it to Arthur. However, we dislike him because of the patronising way he treats Arthur, insinuating that this favour gives Randall a power over him, telling Arthur, 'You can pay me back some other time. You know you're my boy'. At this point, he also refers to Arthur's attackers, the 'NWE' boys, as animals and savages. While this may be true, such vocabulary is intended to portray Randall as racist, partly because 'savage' was a term used by some 'WE' people to refer to some 'NWE' people in earlier centuries, and these overtones, though subtle, remain, not least because they have been maintained by Hollywood. The way he delivers this comment with a note of finality also shows us that he would not be open to discussing whether the boys themselves might be victims of their society, and their behaviour a reflection of that; in other words, he is racist beyond redemption. Besides, Randall's race and gender mark him out for killing, anyway, while Gary, having 'minority' status, is allowed to leave Arthur's apartment after Randall has been killed, instead of joining the ranks of Arthur's victims: three 'WE' men on the subway train, 'WE' man Murray Franklin, 'WE' man Randall, and 'WE' woman Penny, with the police car officer and the two detectives receiving near-fatal collateral injuries resulting from Arthur's toxic presence, and another 'WE' man killed inadvertently by one of the detectives while in pursuit of Arthur on the train. The imagined Sophie sums up this crusade when she tells Arthur, regarding the subway train killings, 'I think the guy that did it is a hero; three less pricks in Gotham City; only a million more to go'. This is also significant in being stated by a 'NWE' woman, that demographic which sits at the top, the opposite end, of the privilege hierarchy among the four basic types.

The dominance of 'WE' people in public life is evident in the guest lists for the 'That's Life' show, a texturing as subtle and subliminally effective as the subway train advertisements. This method makes use of the mere mentioning of names, allowing us to draw our own conclusions regarding the fact that the guests on Murray Franklin's show are probably all 'WE' people, as well as the fact that there are fewer women than men. The only names we may have doubts about are those of the couple, 'Yeldon and Chantel'. This is all in accordance with everything we are being 'taught' about the recent history of our society; it is revisionism in the making and on the hoof, a retrospective propaganda. The names are a little bogus, but we can sense the effort spent in choosing some which are more likely to be interpreted as being those of 'WE' people, rather than otherwise:

Skip Byron  
Greg Gordon  
Hugh Little  
(actor) Ethan Chase (seen: 'WE')  
Chuck Covey  
Arthur Fleck (seen: 'WE')  
Lance Reynolds (seen: 'WE')  
(resident band, 'Ellis Grade and His Jazz Orchestra')  
(guest band, 'Mel Rubin and The Stiffs' (a quaint reference to people being so out of touch that they are practically deceased))  
Sandra Winger  
(actress) Joanne Mulligan  
Diana Hudson  
Doctor Sally Friedman (seen: 'WE')

The surname Gordon is intended to be evidence of some kind of nepotism at work in the city, since this is the surname of the ('WE' male) chief of police in the Gotham universe. And incidentally, the name of the person who calls Arthur to invite him onto 'That's Life' is Shirley Woods. In terms of other names which might be assumed to be 'WE' ones, the articles in newspapers, regarding Penny's neglect of Arthur when he was three years old, were written by B.R. Smith and Hayley Rosenbluth, while Gotham's Health Commissioner is Edward O'Rourke.

Besides this, the television studio musicians and cameramen, when we first see them, are all 'WE' men, as is the presenter who introduces Murray Franklin the first time we see the 'That's Life' show. It is only when entering the final scenes, and certainly beyond the halfway point, once the main messaging has been deployed and ingrained, that we are shown a 'NWE' male member of the television studio band, and a couple of female technicians. One of these, a 'WE' woman, is very out of focus in the background on the main studio floor, and the other, a 'NWE' woman, is monitoring the proceedings on a screen behind the curtain where Arthur makes his entrance. This one is significant because we are being invited to infer that she is only allowed a role behind the scenes, rather than on the main floor; since there is now a 'WE' woman on the main floor, this becomes a racial statement. In addition, it is a gender statement because she is working as a qualified or skilled technician, wearing a headset and studying the clipboard she is holding, while a 'WE' man, working right beside her, is shown to be unskilled and in a menial role; his job is merely to lift aside one of the two curtains to allow Arthur to pass through. Furthermore, it is not as if he is able to even know when this moment is right; he needs to be given the order to lift the curtain by his 'NWE' female colleague. This is powerful stuff, and runs alongside the rather ridiculous profession of 'party clown' designated for some other 'WE' men. The detail in that case comes from the apologetic of inserting a 'NWE' man into the HA-HAs group: although there is a pretense that all of the clowns are not, after all 'WE' men, we do not know whether he is a clown because he is the only one not dressing up or putting on any makeup; for all we know, he might have a different role at HA-HAs, like Gary seems to. Thus, the intention is clearly that, in common with this Narrative elsewhere, 'WE' men are to be shown as both enjoying every advantage of wealth and power in this world, while also being shown as ridiculous, socially inept, weak or idiotic; the cake is, as always, being both had and eaten, with both types also being portrayed as congenitally or unwittingly evil.

We might also note where else 'NWE' men are portrayed, besides appearing as token audience members at Wayne Hall or the 'That's Life' studio. Of course, they cannot be shown, according to the purposes and Narratives of this movie, as having achieved any influence or success, although they can be shown in more servile or auxiliary roles. For instance, none of Pogo's comedians are 'NWE' men, but the MC is one. There is also the barman at Wayne Hall, the Arkham records clerk, working in a windowless cage for years on end, the piano player in the street outside Kenny's Music store, and the auxiliary medical staff at the hospitals. There is also the group of singers which Arthur watches on television, in the movie, 'Shall We Dance' (1937), which shows them in a menial role

acting as physical labourers, while the leader of their song is a 'WE' man sitting at leisure in an immaculate suit. Finally, there are the five boys who attack Arthur in the second scene, which sails close and cleverly to the wind in terms of this Narrative: the boys are mindless, cruel thugs, which makes this incident one of those difficult for leftists to accept. Of course, portraying 'WE' men behaving like this is all they have come to expect, so this scene with the 'NWE' boys stands out as a blasphemy for leftists, even though the perpetrators are male, since the incident speaks to very real and damning crime statistics regarding 'NWE' men in all 'WE' countries. The apologetic is soon underway, of course, as it dawns on us that this society is run entirely by and for 'WE' men, so that, really, these are boys without opportunity or hope. Besides this, in leftist terms, they are not responsible for their sickening behaviour because they would be said to be entirely a product of their society. We can also say where 'NWE' men are not: alone on the subway; they do not fit the Hollywood profile for this because to be alone on the subway in a Hollywood product marks you as a victim or an aggressor, and victimhood is reserved mostly for women, as well as 'WE' men in order to show them as being both weak and easily attacked, while the role of aggressor is reserved for 'WE' men. In considering the 'NWE' men in the cinema audience at Wayne Hall, we should mention that they are very difficult to notice. However, this should be compared with the one 'NWE' woman shown, prominently placed immediately behind Arthur, at the aisle end of the row. This can be read in a few ways. What most springs to mind is that it shows women being able to succeed where men cannot, in a complex addendum to the race Narrative which states that penetrating the 'WE' men's regime looks to be impossible; while a couple of 'NWE' men exist in the theatre, they are not placed as prominently. Meanwhile, this could also be a reference to the racist laws in some states which used to specify that 'NWE' people had to occupy the rear seats on public transport.

There is also a pattern here, as with other movies, that further, incidental layering of the Narratives, such as this, can be added more towards the end of a movie, once the main Narratives and theses have been well established. For example, although roles for 'WE' men in society such as that of Murray Franklin as television presenter are supposed to seem unassailable, there is plenty of scope for change among the more populous demographics of the 'news' programmes. The newsreader profiles consist entirely of 'WE' men until exactly the halfway point, when we hear a female presenter handing over to a Chuck Stevens, while much later, a male presenter hands over to a Courtney Whethers. Also, following Arthur's killing of Murray Franklin, 'the test card' is displayed on the 'That's Life' channel. This used to appear on a television station when nothing was being transmitted, and featured a profile drawing of a 'native American' man, providing another strong flavour of the time. As our vision is widened, taking in the full range of local television stations, we see, on either side of the test card, immediately and most prominently, a 'NWE' man on one side, and a 'WE' woman on the other. Further out, there are four 'WE' men presenting 'news', as well as a 'WE' man (Clint Eastwood) featuring in an advertisement. Another 'NWE' woman also features, while another advertisement shows a 'WE' woman driving, in a car advertisement, and another references rich 'WE' people in history with a coach and horses. Among a host of recordings of things Arthur had said on the 'That's Life' show, the last thing we hear is the voice of a presenter mentioning 'all of those who have been ignored by the system', and that Gotham, that microcosm of the 'WE' world, 'is burning', which crashes straight into the riot scene backed by the song, 'White Room' (Cream, 1968), which includes references deployed here potentially in the name of the race and anti-capitalist Narratives: 'in a white room with black curtains' and 'black roof country, no gold pavements', although a white room would also significantly reference a room in which Arthur is, will be, or should be, incarcerated, in a mental institution.

This is intended to show signs of the 'WE' male establishment unable to maintain its hegemony; that, concomitant with the feelings of the rioters outside, the inevitable, despite habit, power, tradition or resistance has been unable to hold back the tide of justice. It is a signifier of the strong relationship between people's real lives and how they define those lives through what they see and hear on television. This is a leftist praise of television, and the influence it was eventually able to exert on society, as one age unwillingly gave way to the next, our current age in the real world. This movie is, thus, a fantasised enactment of a leftist revolution, as if that had happened suddenly and as a result of popular feeling and physical action in the real world. It is also an invitation or incitement to

the movie's audience to condone any violence used to further their leftist ideology, particularly wherever they perceive 'WE' men to be in positions of supposed authority or power, in which case the message is that those 'WE' men should be castigated and removed, by any means possible, in order to more fully realise the leftists' socialist utopia. Thus, the great deceit of this movie is, ultimately, that the depicted uprising is not one of fire and brimstone four decades before, but the quiet, stealthy one of the present and future, for which this enactment serves as a kind of talisman. Of course, since there is no evidence to currently support any claims of inequality in the real world, history is being mined once again for revisionism and imaginary injustices which can be hauled into the present, to justify this ongoing ethnic cleansing. Such 'progress' is also on display in the social workers: we are shown a 'WE' man interviewing Penny, decades before, while Arthur deals only with 'NWE' women, even in the same institution. This is, therefore, at the final moment, a celebration of leftist achievements: a bunch of 'WE' men dead, the main protagonist incarcerated, and the once-privileged demographic supplanted by one apparently more worthy and capable.

The presence and placement of 'NWE' women is highly significant elsewhere in this movie. The psychiatrist Arthur meets in the final scene at Arkham is not only intended as a signifier of social progress, but also as a bookend to match that of Debra Kane in the early, third scene. This allows for the impression that 'NWE' women have been able, through hard work, capability, and in the face of prejudice at every turn, to make inroads in the fields of medicine, psychology and social work, something which 'NWE' have not managed to do in Gotham. Against such odds as are apparent in the Gotham we see, any such success should undoubtedly be considered heroic. Furthermore, these women are bearing the brunt of caring for the most vulnerable citizens, and the undeserving society depends on them for their experience, professionalism, knowledge and abilities. This work also crosses the line into self-preserving necessity, since jobs are scarce and the cost of living is high, which places additional strain on them as they work with their disgruntled colleagues and clients, in poor conditions; the metal grille on the window which admits almost no daylight, in Debra Kane's office, and the impossible number of clients implied by the stacks of files, is intended to illustrate this. The main 'NWE' female role, however, is Sophie, heroic in the more usual ways of being an effective single parent and holding down a job, while also managing to keep up the appearances of herself, her daughter and their apartment, in ways that the feral Arthur and Penny can only dream of, despite having a lot more time on their hands. She is also accorded the requisite victimhood, in suffering the indignities of the building where she lives, and in being defencelessly stalked by Arthur; in the instance of his intrusion into her apartment, we are being led to consider what danger she might have been in if he had not finally been incarcerated. The single-parent circumstance, meanwhile, is always good for the unspoken invocation of a worthless or dangerous male partner, since we are given to read this circumstance as being the choice of the mother after being burdened with such a man. This can also run the other way, of course, because the man may have proven his worthlessness by simply refusing to be a supportive part of Sophie's life. Again, we are not provided with details, so we make our own inferences according to narratives propagated elsewhere.

Because Arthur crosses real paths with four 'NWE' women, it becomes clear that effort has been made to juxtapose the 'WE' man with 'NWE' women, from their separate ends of the 'progressive' taxonomy, showing the former to be the inferior in each case. This includes the rude 'NWE' on the bus, since Arthur is seated behind her, in a reference to apartheid bus seating of the early 20th century, and because she, being of sound mind, is being disturbed by a symptom of his mental illness. The other medical staff are more evenly spread, though are mostly 'NWE' people. The two significant scenes at Arkham comprise Arthur's conversation at the records office, where the officer is a 'NWE' man, and in the elevator, where we see four 'WE' men: Arthur, alongside a highly disturbed and disturbing patient, an accompanying security officer, and a warden. This scene is intended to show 'WE' men as being prone to mental disturbance, as Arthur is, and as working in relatively menial jobs. A masking then follows Arthur's encounter with the records officer, as he races past a 'WE' male doctor and a 'WE' female doctor, sitting in the corridor. The one victim here, though, is the records officer, who could easily suffer a reprimand or a loss of employment as a result of Arthur's theft of Penny's file. In this, we are supposed to make the connection with Debra

Kane, and the fact that such jobs are precious. As she remarks to Arthur, after telling him that 'They don't really give a shit' about people like him, 'They don't really give a shit about people like me, either'. There is a difference here, however, because although it appears that their suffering is being equated, Arthur is disregarded because he is unsuccessful in a world in which 'WE' men enjoy privilege and advantage, so he is a real loser, whereas Debra Kane is disregarded and disadvantaged because, apparently, she is 'NWE'. It might also be argued that because her trait is only implied in comparison to his, it can read larger in our minds. The difference here also extends to Debra Kane's ability to empathise with others, as Arthur only asks, after she has told him she is losing her job, about where he will now get his medication, whereas she sincerely tells him, 'I'm sorry, Arthur'.

The other appearance of 'WE' women is in the audience on the Murray Franklin show, when Arthur is imagining himself in that audience. The large number of people around him are equally divided between men and women, while they are practically all 'WE', with a 'NWE' couple consciously inserted in the row behind Arthur, not necessarily as a mask, but as if to draw our attention to the fact that such events are patronised almost exclusively by 'WE' people. This is a comment on the way that this culture alienates sections of the community by, among other things, promoting entertainment which may be difficult for 'NWE' people to relate to, something which belongs to the 'host culture'. Although the U.S.A. is a 'WE' country, where most of the people were 'WE' at the time, this is nevertheless intended to be an example of a lack of consideration for the ignored, 'minorities' among them. While the adaptation of a society to becoming more multicultural, even at a non-weaponised pace, is naturally gradual, this movie remains intent on inviting the audience to transpose the circumstances of the country of 40 years earlier onto their present one, almost as if none of these disparities had been sufficiently addressed.

The bulk of passengers on public transport are 'NWE' women, with an elderly 'WE' man or woman here and there. The other remaining instance stands out: the three, young 'WE' men killed by Arthur on the subway train, and the young 'WE' woman they harass. Since she is not a 'NWE' woman, she acts as something of a mask. This might also be claimed because the victims of killing: the three subway men, Penny, Murray Franklin, Thomas Wayne and his wife, and possibly the police officer driving Arthur through the riots in the penultimate scene, are all 'WE' people. However, as has been discussed, this would be in order to portray them as defenceless and weak, rather than deserving of any attention afforded by the prevailing victimology. More importantly, this also serves as an invitation to consider 'WE' people as vulnerable and open to attack, a way of saying either how easy this is, or that such killing is necessary in order to achieve the socialist paradigm shift away from the old world order of capitalism headed by 'WE' men.

As seen elsewhere, the plaid shirt takes its occasional place as the usual signifier of 'WE' redneckness, almost as if everyone had Scottish roots, or as if 'WE' people just have a love for the tartanish aesthetic. Indeed, it is easy to find make negative associations with the patterning itself, such as rigidity and predictability, signifying, perhaps, that those who choose such patterning are inflexible, unimaginative, boring, boxed-in, etc. Certainly, such uniformity of line and spacing is not found in the natural world, and speaks more of mechanisation. With this in mind, we might compare the fabrics which Arthur is deliberately shown to caress when he walks into Sophie's apartment, compared with the interior decoration of his own home, as if we are being told directly to compare the appearance of the two; Sophie's has an array of fabrics patterned 'ethnically', with rich and dark colours and intricate patterning, whereas in Arthur and Penny's, while there is variety, has more predictably 'old-fashioned' decor such as space-filler pictures with no personal value, and flowered wallpaper. Interestingly, there is a plaid wallpaper in Arthur's living room, to which our attention is drawn when he shoots a bullet into it. There is also, absurdly, a full-blown tartan carpet on the stage set of 'That's Life'. Finally, in terms of garments, Gary is wearing a plaid shirt when he visits Arthur with Randall, Murray Franklin wears a tartan jacket to equate him with the clowns, Arthur wears a plaid shirt to Wayne Hall, one of the HA-HAs clowns is wearing a plaid shirt sitting at the table when Arthur 'punches out' for the last time, and Randall is wearing one when he gives Arthur the gun. Randall and Arthur are also seen to have plaid jackets as part of their clown costumes, which are

absurd caricatures of 'WE' men's clothes, while Arthur also has plaid patches on his costume pants, which would look to be almost an in-joke among the movie's producers. Finally, there is Arthur's nylon laundry bag which he is carrying when he kills the three men on the subway train. Such a bag is common enough, but it is an interesting choice given the part which 'plaidness' plays in the Hollywood race Narratives.

Incidentally, we might also consider the fictitious names of the television or news stations here. The one we see most is WBC, though there are also WGC, IBN and NCB. One might speculate about what these letters might be intended to stand for, since there is reason to believe they are not randomly chosen, apparent in the literally sinister logo of WBS, in which we can surmise that the 'W' could stand for 'White'. The logo shows three stacked 'W's of subtly different shades, with the darkest one at the bottom and the white one at the top. As such, this is hypothetically, and comically, the 'White Broadcasting Corporation', and is supposed to add to the impression that we are surrounded by 'WE' people who create secret societies with racist motives, and that they have secret signs which they use to communicate with each other. Although this is inconclusive, it is not far-fetched if we bear in mind the movie's objectives and the level of detail which is often considered; however fleeting or subtle, there is both a cumulative effect and an overall texture which results. This also means that, despite appearances, such work is to be considered artistically accomplished.

The texture of this movie is all the more authentic for portraying the racial division, as with the gender distinction, of those times, even if this are exaggerated or selective. Those who remember the 1970s as it really was would acknowledge that one of the features which 'Joker' reflects somewhat authentically is the racial composition of societal groupings. When we are shown a view of some of the audience around Arthur in his imaginary presence among the 'That's Life' studio audience, for example, as Murray Franklin says 'We got a great looking audience tonight', and see Arthur with five other 'WE' people, and when Penny is being put into the ambulance attended by a crew of three 'WE' men and two 'WE' male police officers, for example, this would be a true reflection of the demographics of that time, and might be witnessed even in New York City, even though such moments are intentionally inserted as exaggerations, in order to incite leftists to greater fury. Elsewhere, there is greater variety, with 'WE' women also taking their place among the crowds, and a few 'NWE' police officers, who are all nevertheless male. The intention with the crowds is to show how everyone, except the 'WE' men who are wealthy, is disadvantaged by the status quo of the system. This mixture, and the effort to prevent us from quantifying it, is assisted by the use of masks and make up. We also have, in fact, instances of 'NWE' people wearing clown makeup which is white, symbolising a 'progressive' ideal of erosion of racial distinctions, although what this always means to them is the ultimate removal of 'WE' people from the world, such that featuring a 'NWE' person in white-face makeup is actually racial subversion, a symbolically racist aggression to mirror the peculiar practice, in times past, of 'WE' people sometimes wearing black-face makeup for theatrical musical performances, itself a symbolically racist act. Since two wrongs do not make a right, and the implications of this are quite obvious, this has probably been inserted maliciously, for contemporary effect. Despite the apparent chaos of the crowds, however, there are choreographed moments, the most significant of which is when a 'WE' man starts the fight on the elevated train, which leads to the savage attack on the two detectives. He does this by violently punching another man merely because he was accidentally shoved from behind in a crowded space, an obvious and gratuitous overreaction which is unworthy of those who otherwise crafted this movie so well.

### Narrative 3: gender (and race)

The gender and race Narratives are more entwined than usual because, interestingly, there is a glaring absence of 'WE' women in this movie, which allows freer rein on the demonisation of the men, as 'WE', which has already been discussed. 'NWE' men are the least represented here, rather

playing the part of fathers absent. It only remains, therefore, to consider women here, and because of the said peculiarity, the 'WE' and the 'NWE' women can be considered separately.

'WE' women are almost entirely represented by Penny, who is not a hero. As the representative of 'WE' women, Penny is seriously flawed, being physically and mentally frail, unable to care even for herself, and has lied to Arthur about his adoption and their background. She is also responsible for the negligence towards Arthur as a small child. As such, she is of the despised, 'WE', Thomas Wayne generation on the way out, so a disrespectful 'good riddance' is being shouted after them as they leave. The age grouping equates Penny with Murray Franklin as well as Thomas Wayne, and all three of them are done away with. The apologetics for Penny are equally unsurprising: she is a standard victim: of the man's world, the violence of her 'boyfriend', the apparent abandonment by Thomas Wayne, and her death at the hands of her adopted son, while her chief role in the storyline is to highlight the bad behaviour of these people, and to let us know that the evil of the world is specifically male.

Elsewhere, in the streets, one 'WE' woman appears as a hooker near the phone booth when Arthur is being fired from HA-HAs, and there are other 'WE' women pedestrians here. One 'NWE' man also crosses the street, while there is also one 'NWE' hooker. This is a dingy area, and is thus not an area where you can see any 'WE' men, since they are only to be portrayed as a privileged class apart. The 'WE' women pedestrians have been inserted because they are included in the hierarchy of victimhood, and thus, having to live or work in this area would presumably not be a choice they would happily make. This is to be compared with the other significant street scene, in the very different, financial district. Of the pedestrians there, we see 1 'NWE' woman (Sophie); 2 'NWE' men; 5 'WE' women; and 20 'WE' men (including Arthur). This marks this district as a place dominated by 'WE' men, and where 'NWE' people are a true minority. 'WE' women, though, besides those who apparently keep their suburban homes for their husbands, seem to be evenly distributed between the different districts, portraying them as a largely neutral factor in Gotham's problems; they can be victims, but while enjoying more opportunities and choices. There are no female clowns or comedians at all, and there are no women on the packed, suburban commuter train. The implication here is that women would not be welcome in these places, or that, despite the ongoing pretence in the real world, there are, after all, vocations which generally appeal more or less to each of the two genders. We might also take the absence of 'WE' women as a signifier of passivity, according to the fact that gender differences were still a feature of that demonised, 1970s world. The absence of 'WE' women among the social services staff also shows this; they are either enjoying the choice of not having to work for a living, or pursuing more fulfilling or glamorous careers. Furthermore, a number of women can be glimpsed passing near Arthur's dressing room at the 'That's Life' studio. Thus, 'WE' women do exist in this city, but seem privileged enough to be able to access a career connected to showbusiness. The apologetic here is that they are, in the main, doing secretarial work and cannot progress through any of the supposed glass ceilings.

There are a fair number of 'NWE' women working in social services, as mentioned, and, to judge from the air of resignation which Debra Kane brings to her work, are overburdened, and working because they have to. Succeeding in the man's world, however, is an indication of some mild lionisation, with the main example of this being the asylum psychiatrist who, as mentioned, is shown as a 'WE' man in the flashback to the young Penny, but has become a 'NWE' woman for the final scene. The instance of the grumpy 'NWE' woman who scolds Arthur on the bus is a chance to show us another example of the single 'NWE' mother; although we have no confirmation of whether this is true in her or Sophie's case, neither do we have any evidence to suggest otherwise, and we are certainly led to draw that conclusion. Like the violent 'NWE' youths who attack Arthur, this woman is a mask for the ultra-demonisation of 'WE' men, a pretence of the aforementioned balance. Like those boys, she can also be easily pardoned for her rudeness because of the presumed disadvantages she was born into and has always had to face; a victim of circumstance. She also cools off after reading Arthur's explanation of his condition. This leaves us with Sophie, a hero of sorts, also surviving in a man's world but in the private sector, as well as being victimised by Arthur's stalking. Incidentally, the song played after we see her for the first time, as she and Arthur are

walking their separate ways in the 8th floor corridor of their building, is moon-related, and since the moon, a feminine deity, is referred to as a sixpence, this woman also represents wealth; something of desirable value.

Regarding women generally, we also hear how these comedians use jokes involving - using - women and wives, depersonalising and even degrading them in the process. Murray Franklin, for instance is heard to say, at the tail end of a joke we have missed, '...I'm not sure if my wife will let me do it...', while one comedian at Pogo's starts an extended joke with, 'I think most women look at sex like buying a car', and another one, speaking of his wife, jokes, 'we love to role-play'. This cements the impression that most jokes at this time involved speaking of women in this offhand way, or of objectifying women as only sexual objects. He continues, 'my favourite one right now is 'professor and senior who really needs to pass my class to graduate', which puts him in the role of student and his wife in the role of professor.

Finally, there is Arthur's resentful comment about not wanting to accept the way the world as it is, telling the 'That's Life' audience, 'They just think that we'll sit there and take it like good little boys', which not only refers to men's immaturity, but would also refer to the unpredictable danger which men represent; if life does not go their way, they will not 'sit there and take it', a warning made good within moments with Murray Franklin's killing.

## Narrative 4: inter/personal estrangement

The common Narrative of familial estrangement is reasonably prevalent here, although not through the usual multitude of incidental references. Being a complex movie in every way, the familial estrangement Narrative is deployed as much through background noise as detail, thus competing with the anti-capitalist Narrative in terms of understatement. This is achieved in the common way of avoiding the portrayal of fraternity; this is a world in which everyone appears to be isolated, from both family members and from everyone else, with the main groupings associated with violence. This also helps to support the notion that everyone, in reflecting societal and cultural norms, lives selfishly, and partly relies on the fact that there is very little dialogue. The exceptions to this negativity, which actually serve as masks, are the care which Arthur takes of Penny, and the few words of sympathy which people say to Arthur. Debra Kane is the most sincere in this, cursorily telling Arthur that she is sorry that their social worker meetings are being stopped. When Arthur loses his work at HA-HAs, Gary expresses heartfelt regret, though this seems to be cancelled out by the utterly insincere comment by Randall, 'Doesn't seem fair'. On another occasion, Hoyt, the manager of HA-HAs, tells Arthur, 'I like you', but by way of softening the harsh blow of charging him for the destroyed sign, and qualified by mentioning that he does not know why he likes Arthur, and that a lot of the other clowns think Arthur is a freak. The only other moment is when Penny tells Arthur 'You need to eat', qualified with, 'Look how skinny you are'. In terms of abuse, there is also very little, but maybe the small amount of dialogue is why the few insulting or threatening words directed at Arthur stand out, most of these provoked by Arthur himself. Therefore, one would wonder why he thinks that everyone is so rude and awful, and has to conclude that this comes down to his mental instability.

Arthur cites the exaggerated problem of people in his notebook, with 'the worst part about having a mental illness is people expect you to behave as if you DONT' [sic], and one takes him to mean people like the rude woman on the bus who tells him, 'Would you please stop bothering my kid [...]. Just stop!' At HA-HAs, the feeling is neither friendly nor unfriendly, but everyone sits as separately as possible, with nobody facing another. In fact, when he is leaving, clearing out his locker, one of them makes a joke about Arthur shooting himself with the gun, which plays to the undercurrent of a suicide theme. This arises when Sophie jokingly mimes shooting herself in the head, then when Arthur responds in kind, and when he repeats this in front of her while sitting in her living room



uninvited, and when he is rehearsing for his appearance on the 'That's Life' show. Thus, we believe until the last moment, since Arthur is so depressed anyway, that he is going to kill himself on the show, rather than Murray Franklin. This theme runs throughout because it is introduced early on, in the third scene, with Debra Kane, when she reads his notebook comment, 'I just hope my death makes more cents than my life', a typical Jokerism which relies on the written pun rather than the spoken one, helping to increase the feeling of muteness and silence among the sparse dialogue. Also in the notebook, Arthur has written, 'I don't want to die with peopl [sic] just stepping over me'. Debra Kane, tuning into Arthur's dysfunctionality, asks him, 'How does it feel to have to come here? Does it help to have someone to talk to?', to which he replies, 'I think I felt better when I was locked up in the hospital'.

The idea that couples might cohabit due to mutual commitment and respect, or for the purpose of raising children, is, as usual, absent. The only substantial instance of this is Thomas Wayne and his wife and son. However, this is set up in order to be torn down, since the orphaning of Bruce Wayne is a premise of the Gotham universe. Furthermore, when Arthur visits Thomas Wayne's house, we find that Bruce is alone in the garden, so might actually be quite estranged from his parents; he is defended, in the end, by the butler, and the parents are nowhere in sight. The more overt instances of familial estrangement are the fact that Arthur is adopted, but that his mother had deceived him about this, and about the absurd relationship she had with her psychopathic 'boyfriend' when Arthur was three years old. There is also the idea that a relationship might only be possible in one's imagination, and we might hardly blame Arthur for that flight of fancy, either. However, elements of coupledness are in evidence, and are worth highlighting. The first instance is when we first see Arthur starting to wearily climb the long flight of steps on his way home. These steps are empty except for one man at the very top, easily descending the steps, and a couple climbing at the very top, holding hands and still going strong as they reach the top. These three figures are tiny specks in the distance, intended to illustrate how far Arthur actually is from the kind of life he might want for himself, as well as the extent to which he will need to end up deluding himself about this. The seating in Wayne Hall and the 'That's Life' studio, as well as the crowding on the public transport, make it difficult to identify couples, and the people here are not shown to interact with each other anyway. This leaves us with the audience at Pogo's, specifically during Arthur's first visit there. In fact, the comedian draws our attention to this by saying 'It's nice to see these couples out at my show', as a way of leading into the 'role play' joke. While there are a few couples discernible in the smoky darkness, we are primarily shown a 'WE' woman on her own, another 'WE' woman whose partner is not included in the image, and a 'NWE' woman sitting with a 'WE' man. Arthur is, of course, alone at his table, while immediately behind him is one table with a man on his own, and another table with two women. Overall, then, coupledness is hardly featured, rather as if stable heterosexual relationships were as uncommon in the 1970s as they are after forty years of the onslaught of advanced cultural Marxism. And so we are largely left, once again, with this phenomenon as something which is always doomed to failure, and either does not exist or is mentioned as something which is imaginary, as in Arthur's fantasy, or the 'wife' jokes of the comedians.

Other instances of familial estrangement include Arthur's attempted joke about a mother being told about her son's death, and the discouraging lack of support which Arthur receives from Penny, shown in her comment about his becoming a stand-up comedian, 'What makes you think you could do that? Don't you have to be funny to be a comedian?'. There is also the usual plethora of absent-fatherism, further denigrating men and their role in society. For example, in Arthur's imagination, Murray Franklin tells his audience that his own father walked out on his family when he was a child. There are also two small pictures on the walls in Arthur's apartment, of the 'mother and son' type. Then, there is the typical single-motherhood of both Penny and Sophie, and the estrangement of Penny from Arthur when he was a small child. Furthermore, the fact that Arthur was adopted also introduces the story of parental rejection, while leaving this part of the background story unresolved also allows the rejection to be doubled, through Thomas Wayne's selfishness. The father-son estrangement becomes very physical when Thomas Wayne punches Arthur in the face, and when Arthur kills Murray Franklin, his father figure, after telling him, 'You're just like the rest of them'. The matricide of Penny is the icing on this tragic pile. After killing her, almost as a kind of duty, Arthur

turns towards the sunlight streaming through the window; it is the launch of his epiphany, a liberation born of sordid, familial revenge.

## Narrative: other

### the media

At first glance, the media, especially television, is demonised in being shown to work in support of the political status quo, giving airtime to Thomas Wayne, and running a chat show hosted by a non-young, 'WE' man, so it is definitely shown to be an important part of the establishment. And the irony of calling the show 'That's Life' is an interesting one because, although it obviously does not reflect any of the reality experienced by most of Gotham's citizens, it is a reflection of the fantasy world of the 'WE' male establishment, so 'That' seems to be 'Life' for some people, although it is also an agency for the growing alienation among the majority.

The media also appear to actively sensationalise the uprising, thereby feeding the fire of the growing dissent. The newspapers, for instance, all chime in with copy from the same hymn sheets, as seen on the suburban train, with headlines including the phrase 'KILL THE RICH', while the television station screens the killing of Murray Franklin without cutting the transmission. This nicely pays tribute to the way that The Joker in the 'Batman' (1966-1968) television series would sometimes hijack television transmissions in Gotham, in order to relay a message to Batman and strike fear into everyone else, while also supporting the idea that what is transmitted is not tightly controlled, which was arguably also the intention in the television series.

There is also something inherently tragic and futile about the extent to which tabloid television is a part of people's lives. When we see this in the lives of Arthur and Penny, and how Arthur even thinks of Murray Franklin as a father figure, we might recognise this from the lives of people we have known. Notably, though, when Arthur enters Sophie's apartment, the television is not tuned to any channel. While this is a nice metaphor for Arthur's state of mind, as he sits down in front of it, it also prevents us from considering Sophie's life to be as tragic and futile as Arthur and Penny's, since such tragedy is most discernible in the specifics of what people consume.

However, the portrayal of the media is played quite evenly in both directions, the demonisation working hand-in-hand with the apologetics because, after all, the mainstream media needs to retain its credibility in the real world of the movie's audience. It does this by pretending to critique the media, in fact, according to what has been mentioned, but also includes some apologetics. The most striking of these is the ease with which Arthur appears on live television and exercises his right to free speech; simply, the public responded to seeing the video clip of Arthur at Pogo's, and Murray Franklin made the decision to invite Arthur onto the show. This, of course, is very much a fantasy, and is prevented in the real world by avoiding live programming and carefully vetting 'guests' and everything they might say, as well as scripting damaging and leading questions for the interlocutors of any 'guests' who do not represent the party line. This is the only reason such 'guests' appear in the media, anyway; like Arthur, they are lured into appearing in order to ridicule them, as well as to support the pretence that 'journalism' and the mainstream media are interested in representing a balanced view of everything; in the real world, there is no 'free-form' conversation as suggested by the 'That's Life' show. Besides this, the 'guests' in the real world are prevented from saying very much at all; nothing of depth is discussed, and nothing is discussed in depth; anything which nears the kind of depth which might avoid insulting our intelligence and dignity is relegated to the secondary media, while anything which is likely to contradict the party line is further relegated to fringe media, or even censored altogether. Such censorship, as we should know, is entirely related to the extent to which leftism and the FWO Agenda would be exposed.

The media is even recognised, by our anti-hero, as didactic and fascist, drawing our attention to this on the 'That's Life' show, saying to the audience, 'All of you, the system that knows so much, you decide what's right or wrong, the same way you decide what's funny, or not'. He also correctly mentions the fact that people think and feel what they are told to by the mainstream media, saying, 'I pass you every day and you don't notice me, but these guys... Why: because Thomas Wayne cried about them on t.v.'. All of this is part of the complexity which cynically exploits what people know about the real world, another case of narratives sailing close to the wind. However, since television and Hollywood are so much more than mere collaborators with surface level politics in the real world, this still falls short of the full truth. This portrayal is simply another way to pretend to be addressing societal difficulties impartially, still playing to both sides of the aisle.

Similarly, apologetics surface in the way that reporters are freely speaking to the citizens in the streets. This approach to representing the public voice is introduced in the radio-broadcast recordings of citizens commenting on the garbage strike, in the first scene, which is as much as to say that the mainstream media can be the voice of its consumers. Significantly, though, an unspoken commentary on this is shown with Arthur pushing the corners of his mouth up and down, in an illustration of fake emotion, as the man on the radio states, 'The news never ends [...]; all the news you need, all day long'. The news is, of course, a manipulator and dictator of emotion, as well as a propagandist for perpetuated false hope, in which talking points and slogans are provided to replace of thinking and personal opinion. As Penny tells Arthur about Thomas Wayne, 'He'll make a great mayor. Everybody says so [...]. Everybody on the news. He's the only one who could save this city'. At the protest, citizens are shown to be free to say whatever they want to, and that it will be broadcast, and this is also suggested in the placement of television reporters at the scenes of the riots, as shown on the many television screens following Arthur's killing of Murray Franklin. All of this serves to claim that television is not controlled to represent only leftist ideology, and that, as with the ballot box scam, the people have a voice.

## masks

The most important motif in this movie might be said to be the use of masks. This interacts with the audience's knowledge of the Guy Fawkes mask used in the 'V for Vendetta' (2005) movie, where masses of protestors turned out wearing masks. In that case, regardless of the Narratives in play, the mask not only ensured anonymity, but also symbolised the spirit of righteous revolution and the overthrowing of the status quo regime, while also acknowledging the virtues of fascist collectivisation, the dissolution of individuality, and immersion in the common cause. All of this is part of 'Joker', too, making 'V for Vendetta' at least as much a candidate for sources and inspiration as 'Taxi Driver' (1976) appears to be. The use of masks in 'Joker' is a very conscious choice, and intersects with other masking motifs, such as laughter. More correctly, this motif would incorporate the use of makeup and wigs, as well as masks, and this is apparent from the outset, with many wig and makeup stores appearing on the street where Arthur chases after his five attackers.

There are links being made between characters here. As a clown, and would-be comedian, Arthur is another form of the Murray Franklin type, those who do comedy at Pogo's. Both Murray Franklin and Thomas Wayne are father figures for Arthur, so Thomas Wayne is also linked as a comedian in this line-up, something which is consolidated when he appears on television after the subway train killings. Although Arthur is the only one of these three men to wear a mask, in the form of makeup, the mask and comedy message linking them is their insincerity and mendacity. Murray Franklin may be a nice guy in reality, but his profession necessitates feigning sincerity and interest, as well as delivering jokes which are made up anecdotes. He is also a clown because he wears a plaid jacket, a muted version of that which the clowns wear for their HA-HAs work. Meanwhile, the fact that Thomas Wayne is another type of clown is recognised by the citizens, as they brandish 'clown for mayor' signs. Furthermore, although Arthur is politically unaware, and says what he means, his profession is an act; he is desperately miserable but has to falsify jollity, as do the other

HA-HAs clowns. Not only this, but the laughing of Arthur's medical condition is also not authentic laughter. All of this leads in the direction of claiming that lying is the foundation of 'WE' society, and that there is nothing about the existence of these people which is not an act. It is a society where people, presumably, cannot be themselves with each other, and are acting at all times, and we are to take this as being 'WE' people especially, as if this were not only congenital, but a part of their culture.

Pretences here would extend to maintaining deceit even with those you are intimate with. This is apparent in the past relationships between Penny and Thomas Wayne, and of Penny and her 'boyfriend', as well as that of Penny and Arthur, since she has deceived him by pretending, for his whole life, that he and she were not themselves. The masking for others is also mentioned by Penny when she tells Arthur that she had removed herself from Thomas Wayne because of appearances, claiming that she could never tell anyone because she had signed some papers, adding, 'You can imagine what people would say about Thomas and me, and what they'd say about you'.

The social acting extends to the pretence of happiness, and the fact that the masks and the makeup have a smile on them helps to make the point that nobody is happy; it has to be faked. As Arthur tells the file clerk at Arkham, 'It's so hard just trying to be happy all the time'. This message is reinforced when we see Arthur, in another Chaplin reference, pushing up the sides of his mouth on two occasions, bookending the storyline, as well as doing the same to Bruce Wayne. In fact, the only way to be at all happy in this society is by being completely detached from it, and Arthur is our example for this. He becomes happier the less he has to lose, and the more he moves into his fantasy world. We see this first when he dances out of HA-HAs for the last time, leaving behind the message, 'Don't [...] Smile!', showing us that this is the message hidden inside the deceptive imperative, 'Don't forget to Smile!'. There is a popular notion of clowns as being sad people, perhaps because the clown act rather suggests its opposite. This is understood by Gotham's citizens, who take to the clown motif instantly, recognising themselves in this badge of misery. They understand that the clown image is ideal for expressing not only their despair, but also their outrage, even violently, because of its traditional irony. As one of the protestor's signs reads, 'we are all clowns', a unifying slogan based on Thomas Wayne's insult. This cements the divide between the two sides and marks the mask as a badge of honour. This looks to be another in-joke, since the would-be revolutionaries, leftists, are being called clowns, and are willingly adopting the mask and all it represents. This is to say that they are the idiots who are so prized by the FWO because of how useful they are, while in the real world, the inability of leftism to apply rationality to any topic has earned it the epithet 'clown world', a fantasy world where nothing makes sense from the non-clown perspective. However, the clownhood of this movie encompasses the entire slave class, so that those on both sides, the so-called leftists and the so-called rightists, are all being ridiculed as useful idiots, perpetuating the game where everybody continues to lose except for the truly masked and anonymous pharaonic class.

The masks also make everyone the same, showing us that this protest is everyone's cause, to the same extent, so is nothing to do with race or gender, which emphasises the fact that the discontent is about the regime. Because the citizens adopt a single identity, it becomes apparent that identity is what this is about, specifically the identity of the object of their wrath, the people who run the regime. This is identity politics, and the enemy is the 'WE' man with all the power and wealth. In order for this to play, the 'WE' men who form part of the suffering citizenry need to be disguised, so we end up, in fact, with the masked class, rather than the slave class, united against the common enemy of 'WE' men. And the masked class is openly derided and misunderstood by that enemy. As for Arthur, in being liberated by his descent into fantasy and killing, and realising that he has nothing to lose and owes no allegiances, he could be said to be shedding the need to keep up appearances. The evening of mayhem is his moment of clarity, so although his makeup stays on, he is shown to symbolically discard his notional mask when he steps off the elevated train on his way to the 'That's Life' studio, leaving behind the mask he had been wearing over his makeup.

Laughter is a particular kind of mask which is widely used in the movie, although usually mingled with sinister overtones. Arthur's laughter is the most obvious example, being a reaction to very negative circumstances, and is, effectively, a cancellation of true laughter. Meanwhile, the laughter of the audiences in response to jokes told at Pogo's or by Murray Franklin, or when watching Charlie Chaplin, is not laughter born of any joy, but in response to falsehoods; it is mendacity with which they are most comfortable. Not only this, but there are negative overtones in the jokes themselves, as has been mentioned in relation to the place of women and Jewish people in society, but also in the spectacle of Chaplin endangering his life by roller skating by the edge of a long drop, the imminent fall of the 'WE' man, which we are being enjoined to laugh at, too. Laughter is similarly juxtaposed with death because Arthur is laughing just before killing the three men on the subway train, and makes a joke of this event when on the 'That's Life' show. He is also pretending to tell a joke as he kills Murray Franklin, and attempts to tell another joke there, about a mother being told that her son has been killed. The sudden interjection of a gun into the children's ward as they are in the middle of a happy song is similarly telling, while there are also instances of non-joyous laughter juxtaposed with misery, including the fact that Arthur's five young attackers are laughing as he chases after them, Arthur's laughing manically while he is looking through Penny's file at Arkham, and the laughter of the three men on the subway train as they harass the woman. Since the laughter is largely an act, the message is that there is nothing, actually, to smile at or be happy about, implying that, in truth, everyone could be depressed and dying underneath their masks. Poignantly, Penny's nickname for Arthur is Happy, a definitive mask, since he has never been happy for a single minute in his life. This aptly matches the words of the aforementioned Chaplin-related song, 'Smile', which we hear during the depths of Arthur's fantasy, after he has been onstage at Pogo's and is walking in the street with the imagined Sophie. Despite its overall instruction to maintain hope, and to believe that however bad things might be, smiling - pretending - can make everything alright, it is one of the most miserable songs ever written, partly due to Chaplin's music. Its pathos and optimism are both extreme, and includes the phrases: 'Smile, though your heart is aching [...], even though it's breaking [...], through your fear and sorrow [...]. Hide every trace of sadness, Although a tear may be ever so near'.

Incidentally, when the three men laugh at the woman on the train, they are laughing along with each other. The same can be said for the audiences at the 'That's Life' studio, Pogo's, and the cinema, which suggests that, perhaps, a lot of this is based on social cues and a herd mentality; they laugh because it is expected, or because others are doing so. This is pointed out by the fact that Arthur does not understand what people might find funny, and seems to make assumptions about what this might be. A particular case in point is his loud laughter at the joke which Randall makes about Gary's height. Because it is a cruel joke, laughing at it is inappropriate, so although he is laughing at a joke, he still does not get it. When he laughs at Thomas Wayne's statement about envious and unsuccessful people being clowns, Penny tells him it is not funny. However, this movie tends towards the in-joke, so while we might agree with Penny, what Thomas Wayne has said is arguably the funniest line in the movie, since it is the voice of the satanic FWO speaking to all of us, and it is funny simply because it is true: that is what they think of the slave class. It is the same as a comedian telling truths for laughs on the stage at Pogo's. As Homer Simpson, crying with laughter at the jokes of a stand-up comedian in 'The Simpsons' ('Homer vs Lisa and the 8th Commandment', 1991), 'It's funny 'cause it's true'.

Once he has been incarcerated, Arthur is laughing once again. However, this is still within his epiphany phase, and may even finally be authentic rather than sardonic laughter. When the social worker asks him to tell her the joke he has thought of, he replies, 'You wouldn't get it'. This is because it is the in-joke; the joke of Hollywood and everything else about the mendacity we spend our whole lives drowning in, and Arthur has understood this ever since he told Penny, before killing her, that his life is a tragedy, rather than a comedy. In fact, we are to understand that these are two faces of the same coin, and that one is simultaneously the other. This is why misery and killing are shown to accompany laughter. This is not only the truth of the world as Arthur knows it, but the truth of the real world under the same ancient and persevering system, and since Hollywood plays a significant part in the deceit, this is really being said to the audience; they have been so steeped in propaganda

that they would not get it even if it were told to them. Arthur is also saying that we each have our own perspective on the world, and that this is difficult to share, or for others to understand. The joke for Arthur, perhaps, is that he has been severely disadvantaged, as a 'WE' man, while categorised with the Thomas Waynes of the world. Maybe this is what is so funny, since his experience of the world is the very opposite of what is propagandised and believed. Like the false smiles and masks, Arthur belongs at the very bottom of the hierarchy while being told he is at the top of it. And the social worker, since she exists at the opposite end of the spectrum, as a 'NWE' woman, being the most advantaged while believing herself to be the most disadvantaged, would certainly not get it. His dancing down the hallway into heavenly sunlight, in the final moments of the movie, is joyous because he is free now of illusion; he has realised what the joke is and no longer has resentment or expectations because he gets it.

Finally, the motifs of laughter and the masks are themselves masks, in an overall sense, scattered along the storyline in order to tell us that the movie is about one thing - the demonisation of a psychopathic loner, perhaps - while really being about something else - the usual Narratives combined with an incitement to socialist and 'progressive' revolution, with all the story's elements, including the usual Narratives themselves, hiding in plain sight and conspiring to conceal the movie's wholly nefarious intentions and purposes.

### names

To consider our protagonist: Arthur is not real, he has no substance in the world, and whatever may be said about what he did, none of his role as a catalyst for revolution is intentional; he appears to have no apparently direct effect on anything. As he tells Debra Kane, 'For my whole life, I didn't know if I even really existed'. This works nicely with the Arthur of royal legend, who, with the absence of historical records, or any significant actions, has only mythical status. Arthur is also the name of the eponymous protagonist of a movie playing at that time, in 1981, the poster for which appears at the front of the cinema in the penultimate, riotous scene. This is a comedy, and the main character is played by a comedian, Dudley Moore, whose character is that of an extremely wealthy 'WE' man. His only positive attribute is that he can be pleasant company because he is always laughing, but he has no aptitude for anything and is also not going to leave his mark on the world. This and his kingly wealth are likely the reasons why this name was chosen for that character, and that choice is repeated in the decision about Arthur Fleck. Because the Arthur of 1981 is extremely wealthy, he also works as a combination of Thomas Wayne and Arthur Fleck. To take some further poetic licence with this, we could consider Bruce as being the name of an ancient lineage of kings, so in juxtaposing Arthur with Bruce, we are practically referring to two ancient kings, who will later come to represent the struggle between good and evil on the Gotham stage, helping to mark this as a struggle between socialism and capitalism, respectively.

The surname, Fleck, is a disparaging one, since it refers to an insignificant piece of dust or dirt, while Penny is also entirely Dickensian, signifying poverty. 'Penny' also collocates with 'dreadful', which she did seem to be, as a mother when Arthur was young, and can serve as another reference to facile amusements such as television, by which she seems dominated. Trouble is also taken to mention the name Carnival, in the coincidence which Arthur perceives in hearing a song about someone with this name, because it was his clown name. The word 'carnival', although it evolved into an association with having a fun time, can also be interpreted as having sinister overtones, since it means the removal of flesh, or goodbye to flesh, helping to signify Arthur as a killer. The other piece of name fun is reserved for the neighbour, Sophie Dumond. Being the main 'NWE' female character, she comes closest to being lionised in the storyline, although this extends to being merely flawless and being subject to Arthur's stalking, but of course, can handle herself perfectly well. As such, she possesses the one heroic name, which basically translates as 'Wisdom of the World', a very fair comparison to 'Penny Fleck', it must be admitted.

## images

A few of the images on the walls are worth mentioning, as artistic detail which enhances texture without adding anything to the storyline. As mentioned, there are the two 'mother and son' ones in Arthur's apartment, to signify the absent father, as well as the advertisements on the subway train when Arthur kills the three men, to reinforce the message that this is an exclusively 'WE' man's world. And in case there is a temptation to believe that such detail is accidental or hardly considered, we should consider the 'I [love] GOTHAM' postcard on the mirror in Penny's bedroom, which needed to be created by someone, for its fleeting and inconsequential appearance, and even though it has no bearing on the Narratives at all.

In addition to these, just inside Arthur's front door, there is a 'covered wagon' image, to signify the idea that the rule of the nation by 'WE' people can be traced back to colonisation and the questionable theft of the country from the indigenous people. Then, there is a poster in Debra Kane's office with the 'instruction', 'IT'S NORMAL TO FEEL TRAPPED', practically implying that we should all feel that way, all of the time, and on the opposite wall, framing Arthur's head, are two pin-ups with the prominent words, 'DRUGS' and 'DEPRESSION'; the kind of office you might visit if you wanted to feel worse instead of better about life. There are also the two, large prints of old paintings behind the television in Arthur's apartment: one of a nobleman, and one of a noblewoman. Although such portraiture would typically feature one person alone, it is nevertheless highly significant that two such portraits are placed here; it is no random placement. They help to portray the lives of adults in isolation, rather than as part of a family, which applies to Arthur and Penny, as much as to anyone else. The subjects are also both 'WE' people, and both wealthy. Again, even though this was typical of such portraiture, the point is made and taken, regarding the race and anti-capitalist Narratives, as well as the sad aspirations and delusions of these 'WE' people, and how far we are to consider they have fallen over the centuries. There is also one fleeting image, among the various 'clown' posters, which Arthur passes on his way to Hoyt's office at HA-HAs. It is an amateur painting, also historical-looking, of a circus lion tamer. This shows, all within a large cage, five lions surrounding the man, who is apparently defenceless. The lions are not passive, all have their jaws open, and one of them has its paws on the man's shoulders. This is intended to portray Arthur's predicament in the jungle of the streets, having just been attacked by the five boys.

Far less overtly, and possibly unintentional, the bathroom at Wayne Hall is of a 'Star of David' patterning. Also rather incidentally, there is a toy, blue guitar on the sofa in Sophie's apartment, which is placed there to signify the musical roots of 'NWE' people in the U.S.A., arising from the time when the institution of slavery was still a part of the culture; it is Sophie's equivalent to the covered wagon image in Arthur's apartment. The colour of the guitar is, of course, intended to signify the sadness, both of the times past and of the present, of 'NWE' people in that country. Then, there is the matter of equating Arthur and Bruce, as being two sons of Thomas Wayne and destined to come into conflict with each other later in life. This is done using identical colours for their garments when they meet at the gate of Thomas Wayne's property. When Arthur pushes the corners of Bruce's mouth upwards, this also signifies their common destiny.

Finally, we might notice that in the penultimate, rioting scene, someone is holding a placard with the word 'RESIST', but upside-down. It is difficult to know if this was an error, or whether it was intentional. Thus, it might remain entirely insignificant if our attention were not drawn to its idiosyncratic font, allowing us to identify the exact same word in that same font sprayed onto the outer wall of Arthur's building, this one being the right way up. It is tempting to consider, then, not least because it stands out as such a relatively innocuous and anaemic slogan, as well as the fact that Thomas Wayne's wife looks back over her shoulder, for no good reason, at the person carrying this sign, whether this is more than a chance ingredient. We might consider whether the inversion is intended to mean its opposite, 'do not resist', while introducing a cycle of revolutions, as we move back and forth between the two 'RESIST's, conducting the manipulated members of a society to resist and to not resist, simultaneously or sequentially, according to the whims of the puppeteers.

## guns

Because an armed citizenry remains a potential difficulty for the FWO, they have preached it as a contentious issue for leftism, whose adherents have allowed themselves to be worked into a fake, hoplophobic frenzy, despite having to deal not only with resisting the internal demands of logic, but also the cognitive dissonance of rooting for a societal inequality. This issue is always hovering around the edge of Hollywood products, and as we have seen elsewhere, effort is often made to place a gun in the hands of someone mentally unstable, as here. This leads to the deaths of four people who would not have been dead were it not for Arthur's gun, while the only other gun featured is that used by the anonymous 'WE' man who kills Thomas Wayne and his wife. This is an interesting complexity since, while we are intended to consider Arthur's having a gun as being a bad thing, and that guns are misused, we are also encouraged to consider the deaths of these people as being a good thing, these being two questions well-positioned to test our conscience. The first question slips under the conscious radar, however, because it is dominated by the latter, although the image of the mentally ill loner with a firearm stays with us, linking to the same narratives running through all media, which work to erode citizens' rights to self defence. Furthermore, guns are here only associated with 'WE' men, and Arthur's appears to be an illegal possession, being passed from Randall to him covertly, and about which Randall becomes very nervous, following the subway train killings. It should also be mentioned that the gun does not excuse Arthur in the ease with which he takes others' lives with a gun, since he also kills two other people by other means, showing him to be a natural born killer regardless.

## the numbers of the gateway

Incredibly, although it is not unprecedented in Hollywood by any means, significant numerology has been inserted into this movie and, as usual, has no bearing on the storyline, being included, rather, as a magical device. The numbers are '911' and '11.11'. The first of these, as we know, is both the emergency services telephone number in the U.S.A., established in 1968, as well as being the date on which the 'twin towers' of the World Trade Centre in New York City (Gotham) were destroyed in 2001, as the centrepiece of an intricately planned and far-reaching occult and 'gateway' ritual sacrifice, an event linked to various other iterations of these numbers. For example, it was in 1111 that nine crusader knights in Palestine founded the Knights Templar, later renamed freemasons, while the first plane to have allegedly hit the towers was Flight AA11, a clear '11.11' reference. And besides other military and political events, always engineered to the detriment of humanity, the most significant other '911' dates are arguably: 1922, when the British Mandate of Palestine began; and 1941, when the ground for the Pentagon in Washington D.C. was broken in a freemasonic ceremony.

The number 11 itself is most obviously illustrated by the two towers themselves, and the date of '911', the digits of which add up to 11, but it is the doubling of this number which provides for more powerful effects. For this reason, each of the towers was built with 110 storeys, in the full knowledge of the plan to take them down ceremoniously at a later date. In the movie, such references are equally unambiguous, as if the movie's producers intended for us to uncover them, enjoying the idea of the fallout among the sleuths discussing the numbers' significance, and the concomitantly enhanced reputation and popularity of the movie for decades to come. Certainly, this is a signifier of very conscious crafting, which tells us how important its producers considered this movie to be, and, at the very least, of the cultural and societal influence they intended it to have. As with all satanic ritual deployed against us, Hollywood products need to incorporate spells, in a very real sense, if they are to have a chance of effecting the intended changes to the detriment of humanity, and this would include both lexis and numbers.

Our initiation into the deliberate placement of these numbers into this movie is clear: they are given in the time which appears on three 'analogue' clocks, at the time of '11.11', with a fourth instance



heavily implicated. The three clocks are shown: when Arthur first meets with Debra Kane in her office; when he leaves HA-HAs for the last time, drawing our attention to the time by punching the 'punch-out' clock until it falls off the wall; and when we have the flashback of Arthur in his earlier incarceration in a mental institution, where he is shown next to a clock while he bangs his head against a panel of safety glass set into a door. This is an odd image because it follows Debra Kane's phrase, 'locked up', implying that we are seeing Arthur incarcerated inside a room which he wants to leave, but this appears to be happening in a corridor outside the room, since the door would open away from Arthur, not into the space towards him, and the placement of the clock, and the sign above the door which tells us it is the 'OBSERVATION ROOM', do not belong on the inside of such a room. Although it might be interesting to speculate on the symbolism here, this looks to be a mere production convenience. The main point, however, is that a clock has been placed very obviously in the frame, and that all three of these clocks read exactly '11.11'. No other clocks can be found in the movie except for the one in the 'That's Life' studio when Arthur comes onstage, at which point it reads just after 10.40 p.m. It is because of the other three times shown to us that we are led to assume that, following the chat with, and the killing of, Murray Franklin, and the subsequent arrest of Arthur, that he ends up getting to his feet on the hood of the police car, to the cheering of the rioting crowd, at exactly '11.11' p.m., since the time seems to fit, and the clock in the 'That's Life' studio has been deliberately placed. This latter reference is another example of how subtlety is artfully used in this movie. Thus, we have  $4 \times '11.11'$ , a perfect square, squared; our placement on the metaphorical chessboard; a revelation of the perennial battlefield.

This alerts us to the potential for other significant numbers, and these are almost absent until that same crucial scene with the police car. As it takes the corner onto the main street of destiny, to the sound of Cream's 'White Room', we see its licence plate number, '9189'. The rear of the car shows this number twice: on the plate and on the body, and it appears another three times on the car: on the right and left sides, and on the front plate, making five times all together. In addition to this, the number '75' (the number of the local administrative precinct) is featured twice. Furthermore, we are shown all sides of the car. The numbers fall out as follows:

'75'  $\times$  2 = 150. The digits of 150 add up to 6, which can also be stated, visually, as '111111', or  $3 \times '11'$ . Of course, '33' is also highly significant, freemasonically speaking, while freemasonry's fingerprints are all over the false flag of '911'.

'9189'  $\times$  5 = 45945, which is also, visually, '45.9.45', or '999'. Also, if we add the two inner numbers, '1' + '8', we arrive again at '999'. These three nines can be happily paired with the three elevens inherent in the '75'  $\times$  2, but also appear to signify a 'one second to midnight' scenario, the end of an age before the clock digits roll over to restart at zero, making it the number of conflagration or revolution, with Arthur Fleck as the unlikely phoenix, rising again to bathe in the flames. We might also turn the number, as suggested by the mirrored writing of 'AMBULANCE', with which the police car has become practically joined, to arrive at '666' which, whatever clichés might be claimed for it, and besides referencing our planet, is nevertheless a signifier of 'revelation' and the unleashing of an end-of-times apocalypse. It is worth recalling the Tarot principle here: it is not that numbers or words, or their combinations have power in themselves, but that power can accrue to them, especially over time, according to the extent that people associate them with such power. Incidentally, the turning of a number would simply equate to mirroring it twice: vertically and horizontally.

'9189' also leaves us with the reduction to a single '9', regardless of how many times it is multiplied. Another reduction of '75' down to 12 ( $7 + 5$ ) gives us the option, based on one of our methods, of identifying the difference between 1 and 2. Thus, '75' can also give us two '1's to accompany this overall '9'.

'911' is also possible if we consider the difference between the last two digits:  $'91(89)' = '911'$ .

Furthermore, there is another '911' on each side of the car if we again make use of these number pairs:

'7' + '5' = 12, and the difference between 1 and 2 = 1

'9' + '1' = 10, and the difference between 1 and 0 = 1

'8' + '9' = 17, and the difference between 1 and 7 = 6

Arriving at '116', we can turn the number image around again, to arrive at '911'. This is admittedly more far-fetched, subjectively speaking, but can be admitted as auxiliary evidence, especially considering our admission of the 'turned' number mentioned above, all being juxtaposed with the mirroring of 'AMBULANCE'.

While the number 12 could also be added to the palette of final numbers, if we added '7' + '5', in order to account for the sum of the digits in the entire, said date:  $9 + 11 + 01 = 12$ , as some analysts do, this looks to be very tenuous in comparison to the other numerical possibilities because the date is '2001', rather than just '01', and should not be admitted here.

'9189' is also an '11.11' number: the ninth number of the alphabet is 'i', so we have our two outer digits, visually '1' and '1'. The two inner digits are '18', another two nines; two 'i's.

'11.11' is also the sum of the two sides of the car when considered another way. Each side has '75' and '9189':

the difference between '7' and '5' = 2

the difference between '9' and '1' = 8

the difference between '9' and '8' = 1

$2 + 8 + 1 = 11$ , so two sides of the car give us '11.11'

In a different scene, '11.11' is also indicated in the taxi which crashes into Arthur as he is running from the two detectives, and our attention is drawn to this car because of this movie's clear acknowledgement of the movie 'Taxi Driver'; a collision of the two movies. The licence plate of the taxi is T 4936. This number encodes '11.11' in two ways. Firstly, the numbers, when added, total 22, which is two 11s. Secondly, there are two instances of reduction to 4: in the difference between 49 and 36, equalling 13, where  $1 + 3 = 4$ ; and when we add the two pairs separately, as  $4 + 9$ , and  $3 + 6$ , we get 13 and 9, with the difference between them being, again, 4. This is significant in the way that 6 was, in providing 1s, but in this case it is even more explicit, since 4 is more directly rendered as '1111'.

Taking the '11.11' visual further, we have Wayne Hall of which the centrepiece comprises four Corinthian columns. Not only this, but there is a large image of Chaplin strung between the columns of the two outer spaces, marking these columns as a distinct pair of 11s. Not only this, but the Chaplin images are mirrored, one being a reflection of the other, with Chaplin's eyes turned towards the space between the two pairs. The facade is also, overall, a '666' image: the three spaces between the columns stand above three arched doorways, while on each side of the centrepiece are, lined up with the columns and the doorways, two levels of three windows each. Meanwhile, 'back at the bat cave', meaning Arthur's building on the other side of town, the alter-ego of Wayne Hall, Arthur also passes through one of three outer arches on entering. On each of these arches, there are two, small ornate columns on either side, so one is also passing through an '11.11' each time one enters or leaves the building.

In moving on to the year in which the movie is set: even though this appears to be the 1970s, it is inescapably 1981, because of the movies showing at the cinema. Both 'Zorro the Gay Blade' and 'Blow Out' are 1981 movies, as is 'Arthur', the poster for which is in a display case outside the cinema, the name haunting Thomas Wayne and his wife and son as they scurry past it towards their date with destiny, in the alleyway next door, a few moments later. Although 1981 is a number with '911' within it, this is not where we are headed. Rather, taking the two outer digits as our outer columns or '1's, we are left with  $9 + 8$  in the centre, giving us 17. If we further reduce this, as  $1 + 7$ , to 8, this gives us the letter 'H', and the complete image of '1H1', which is '11.11' with a joining or

separating device between the two pairs. While this looks a little obscure, it is nevertheless impressive how this year can still be brought to land quite comfortably within our remit. Furthermore, we should consider how deliberately we are being directed to this year by how prominently the two movie titles are shown; it is impossible to miss them as they arrive centre-screen, taking up almost a quarter of the frame.

Besides the freemasonic squaring inherent in the 4 x '11.11' of the clocks, which itself references '911', there is a host of meaning associated with 11s. This number has long been associated, above any other, with intuition, psychic ability and enlightenment, as well as liberation and transformative renewal, all highly significant here. As an image, the number clearly signifies duality and balanced opposites while also creating a central space; a doorway, so it is easy to see why this number has always been linked with new beginnings.

All of this is augmented by the doubling of the number, which is also all the more striking when it catches our attention in daily life; synchronising with '11.11' appears to us to be more significant than a meeting with a single 11; the latter is easily found at any time, while the chances of encountering '11.11' are naturally less likely. As such, this easily becomes, for people, a number signifying synchronicity, and we will tend to invest it with meaning when it occurs. Even if this can be represented as a mere accumulation of chance occurrences without meaning or effect, that is only to willfully miss the point. Rather, the meaning which people assign to the number or the image, as mentioned, is what accrues very real power to it. An intentional focus on a number, image, or words will build potential within those objects, which can eventually be harnessed and applied in the physical world, affecting our reality, according to the Tarot principle. This is all the more so in the case of objects which receive such attention from large numbers of people, people in groups or simultaneously, and over long periods of time; the objects end up with 'thought form' or energy attached to them, and can then be deployed to draw and direct attention, even though unconsciously perceived, and be attached to other signifiers according to the directors' wishes. Whether the vast majority of people acknowledge this or not, it is part of the physics of our universe, the knowledge of which has been guarded jealously by those who have always used it for their own gain, and to our ongoing detriment, while that lack of general understanding about it, as well as any passionate resistance to it, by scientism, for instance, is precisely the attitude which has always been desired and engineered among the slave class.

When '11.11' occurs in our lives, as part of our personal journey and interaction with our being outside of time and space, it is a personal dialogue in which we are getting our own attention, in order to focus on our divinity and true purpose. We can manifest '11.11', for instance, in order to make it easier for us to do this part of our real work, that of contributing to the universal balancing of opposites and dualities. When this happens, we are more open to further manifestation, and dealing with all those things which 11 and '11.11' are said to represent: new beginnings, accessing higher spiritual realms or selves, and consciousness-expansion. Overall, this comes down to what we would call awakening, which facilitates a passing through a gateway into a new paradigm of self, which some would describe as a doorway between two worlds. It should be clarified, however that consciousness shifting is both individual and planetary-wide, at the very least; we are all part of each other's journey.

However, we are in the unfortunate and critical situation of not being entirely self-directed. The greater potential for humanity's shift in consciousness which exists in this time is a threat to the hegemony of the satanic FWO on this planet, and since it is a force of nature, rather than resist it, they have been doing what they can to hijack its trajectory, focussing humanity on their narrow agenda, and directing us towards the idea, if not the reality, that any awakening or movement into a new paradigm is limited by our past conceptions about what is possible or probable; they are intensely focussed on keeping us bound by our mental, physical and spiritual slaveries, and to direct the consciousness shift towards everything negative. This is a volatile project, however, because the satanic route is a perversion of our true destiny and divine potential, as well as running entirely contrary to the will of nature, but they sincerely believe they can pull this off simply because they

have succeeded with the same model for so many millennia already; they live in refutation of what is, in fact, humanity's destiny. As such, this needs to be carefully, gently managed, and ideologies, along with all manner of propaganda, mendacity and distraction, are thus wedded to the old paradigm of fear, with an intensity and clarity of focus unknown previously. Thus, the old paradigm, rather than being mere 'capitalism' or the infantile ideology of "'WE" man: bad', as propagated by Hollywood, is simply 'fear', which is, in the end, entirely abstract and insubstantial, easily overcome once we reach the tipping point, of which the satanic FWO is terrified.

Stepping in to provide a focus for humanity's spiritual radar, then, we were treated to their '911' show which, as indicated by the confluence of this number with that of '11.11', was intended as the gateway we might have been looking out for, drawing our attention to the gateway itself, in the form of the 11 of the twin towers. However, instead of signifying the end of our wandering in the desert and our enslavement under the pharaohs, we were treated to the image of the destruction of the gateway and the immediate removal of any remaining illusions about our eternal birthrights as human beings. This event was a negating of the gateway, while also being the gateway, in fact, to the next stage of the satanic Agenda; the FWO, not we, were once again dictating the script, and in the habit of generations, we watched and followed along obligingly. This was an 'anti-gateway', if you like. So successful did this event seem to have been that the FWO came to idolise it, and are now found to be fetishising it, making use of its non-physical energy to drive the Agenda forward. As such, the idea of revolution, as seen in this movie, is harnessed to the combined magic of Tarot, numerology and the fetishised FWO event, in order to push the leftist, 'liberal', 'progressive', etc. agenda as hard as possible.

Along these lines, we might also consider other attributes of the movie's main event, which is not the killing of Murray Franklin but the crashing of the police car and the anti-hero's 'ascension' on the car's hood. It should be considered salient not only that the police car is stopped by an ambulance, but that they stop each other. These two vehicles, crash at an intersection, which, like the cross of the Knights Templar, can represent the intersection between vertical and horizontal societal control; where feudalism meets fake democracy. This idea is embodied in the fact that these two vehicles embody both state control and state protection. The collision of these two marks the end of the line for such ways of thinking about human society, and takes us, on the evening of the 'revolution' into a hiatus, free-floating until we land on our next satanically-designated path. This symbolically presents options, to choose between limited ideological directions, with the signals on the avenue all showing green, and with no right turns allowed. But while this may be interpreted as being the facile choice between the old dichotomies of capitalism and socialism, it is actually an invitation and prompt to take a different, darker path, into a night of perpetual Armageddon for humanity, for which socialism is revealed for what it always was: the ideological vehicle of engineered hatred deployed, now that technology has been sufficiently developed, for the purpose of humanity's ultimate destruction.

### 'Joker' meets the world

More ingenious intricacy is evidenced in this movie's extensive and explicit copying or referencing other movies, most especially 'Taxi Driver' and 'King of Comedy' (1982), lifting easily identifiable portrayals and scenes from those movies and subverting them, through the process of literary typology, to the ever more extremist 'liberal' ideology, which was clearly less overt at the times when those other movies were made. This is very much an ancient tradition within literature and storytelling, as well as across the arts in general, where one work is mapped onto another, the same motifs in an updated context, very much in the ancient Roman tradition with regard to the Flavian creation of religions. Such is also the case among Hollywood products, not only in pure remakes, but also incidentally. What is less apparent, however is the common referencing of other works through mere mentions, and it always transpires that the mentioned works can be related to the current work, sometimes to the extent that one imagines that the referenced works might even have

provided the entire basis and inspiration for the later one. At the very least, it is usually interesting, if not enlightening, to discover the parallels between them.

Discounting the Hollywood 'Batman' products, there are, besides the reference to 'Arthur', which has a few parallels in 'Joker', one of which is the New York City setting, the movie homages in this movie are 'Blowout' and 'Zorro the Gay Blade', the titles of which are both shown prominently on the cinema awning in the penultimate scene, with the shot being slow enough to show that our attention is being deliberately drawn to these movies. The salient points listed here are those which resonate most strongly with elements in 'Joker':

In 'Zorro the Gay Blade', Set in 19th century Mexico, Zorro's son, Vega is first seen cheating on his wife with another woman, and having to fight off her husband and five brothers when they are found out. After his father's death, Vega takes over his father's Zorro role, while also inheriting wealth and property. This role comes with a mask, hat and cape, and a mission to right wrongs for the common people. There is also a romantic interest between Vega and a 'liberal' feminist activist, Charlotte, who, like him, wants to overthrow the local governor, who has been installed in a rigged 'election'. Vega attends a masked ball dressed as Zorro. When he becomes incapacitated, his twin brother, Bunny, takes over the Zorro role, but makes flamboyant changes to the image because he is extrovertly homosexual. Later, when Vega takes the role back over, Bunny is seen dressed as a woman. A later intrigue has Vega disguising himself as a monk, soon followed by a peasant uprising.

'Blowout' concerns the work of a movie sound engineer, Jack, who is looking for a scream to use in a movie about a psycho killer stalking women. Jack rescues a woman, Sally, from a car accident he witnesses, while another passenger escapes. The driver of the car, the local governor who was running for the office of president, has been killed in the accident. It turns out that the married governor was having an affair with Sally. Jack later discovers that the accident was actually an assassination using a gun, and he has an audio recording of it. He also learns that Sally wants to be a makeup artist, but is struggling in a clerk's position. In the end, Jack is invited onto a television talk show, with the plan that he plays the incriminating evidence he has of the assassination. The corrupt officials from the governor's office end up murdering two women, and manage to trick Sally into meeting them. In his pursuit of them, Jack accidentally crashes his car into an Independence Day street parade, becoming temporarily unconscious. Sally ends up being killed and Jack kills the hitman with a knife.

'Taxi Driver' is the main reference, however, since we have even more consciously specific elements. These include the setting of New York City in the 1970s, the fact that the protagonist is a 'WE' man who is a loner, stalks two women, acquires a gun, hangs around at political rallies with the intention of killing the governor who is running for the office of president, then ends up killing three men during a vigilante rescue of one of the two women, and is thereafter hailed as a hero. There is also a reference to the filth of the city and the protagonist's detestation of the people, and the alteration of his personality into one more dangerous and unpredictable, as a result of alienation and a personality disorder which serves also to keep him estranged from his parents. Also, the pointing of a gun at the television, before destroying it by pushing it to the floor, is also very much a symbolic gesture regarding the insidious vacuity of television.

In 'Joker', there is also the appearance of a jacket, similar to that worn by the protagonist in 'Taxi Driver', being worn by the driver of the ambulance which crashes into the police car, who then helps to lift Arthur onto the car's hood. There is something ultimately symbolic in this gesture, where the two movies are intentionally and ceremoniously ritualised. This is one of the clues showing how 'Joker' has come to supersede its forerunner, to augment and weaponise any of the 'Taxi Driver' elements it can, but paying homage to it only insofar as this provides the mask for 'Joker's' true purposes. Indeed, we are also told, in no uncertain terms, that 'Joker' is the winner here, and that the contest between them can even be considered a physical one. This is achieved through two deliberate incidents: When Arthur collides with a taxi while running from the two detectives, he rolls off the windscreen unhurt, while the taxi suffers a cracked windscreen and is left standing still, as

Arthur runs off to fulfil his destiny. As such, this is a case of 'Joker' hitting 'Taxi Driver', rather than the other way around; Secondly, when the police car and ambulance collide at the crossroads, this causes one other vehicle to lose control, another taxi, which ends up very symbolically overturned.

It is no wonder that 'Taxi Driver' is denigrated in this way. It was an entirely innocent movie in comparison to the sophistication of the later propaganda; it did not contain any of the Narratives so consciously deployed in 'Joker', and this renders the resemblances superficial. However, it is ingenious that many specific elements have been used in order to make the referencing obvious, because this itself is a mask, intended to satisfy those who might consider investigating the allegorical parallels, thinking that they have done the work of deciphering 'Joker' and its influences. This is intended to block further investigation, leaving the movie to covertly fulfil its purpose in deploying not only the usual propaganda and negativity, but also as a spell of satanic magic. The extent to which so-called critics miss the point and purpose not only of 'Joker' but of any Hollywood products, is evident in high-profile reviews published at the time of 'Joker's' release, while the same kind of limited fare can be found in relation to any new movie.

One cursory synopsis merely states that 'Joker' is about 'a man struggling to find his way in Gotham's fractured society'. Inching slightly closer to the mark, another tells us that 'No one [...] is remotely likable', and another, while the misunderstanding is evident in the statement that there is a lack of meaning, and that it might be employing 'love your neighbor' as a theme, at least recognises that it is about 'capitalism sucks'. But that review concludes, incredibly, that the director has practically nothing to say. Another review is entirely descriptive, while also misinforming us that 'Arthur becomes a vigilante, joining the underground forces in corrupted, criminal-infested Gotham City'. It proceeds with the additional falsehood, 'One of his victims is the wealthy politician running for mayor. This would imply that the reviewer had not actually watched the movie. So much for vocation.

Some other reviews at least take the trouble to enter into some discussion, and in doing so end up skirting the main themes somewhat. One calls the movie 'timely' and 'toxic', citing the tapping into of a 'festering resentment on the part of the have-nots' in the real world, but then considers the subway train killings merely descriptively, as being caused by the victims 'harassing a woman and assaulting the shooter'. Another reviewer recognises that Arthur 'isn't really railing against PC culture or how he's owed anything', painting the movie as a portrait of Arthur as a self-pitying man of the "My life sucks!" and "Nobody cares!" type. But the lack of comprehension is evident in the statement that the movie's writing is 'too vague and incoherent to really land a point'.

A reviewer in one hyper-leftist rag seemed to get to grips with some of the apparent messaging in the movie, coming closest to the mark by calling it 'an intensely racialized movie, but says this is 'so provocative, and so unexamined as to be bewildering'. However, this is simply because that reviewer was easily bewildered, and cannot be taken as a reflection on the movie. This also speaks of preconceptions and expectations, besides the obvious ignorance about what Hollywood is for, or that the main Narrative of race deployed in every product is deployed in different ways for different reasons. Incredibly, the writer accuses the producers of 'political cowardice' and 'mere entertainment', releasing the movie in order to placate non-leftists 'who are exasperated with the idea of movies being discussed in political terms'. This writer clearly believes that Hollywood products should be highly and overtly politicised, but does not realise that this is the case anyway. To call this movie, of all movies, unpoliticised, is a staggering example of willful blindness and cognitive dissonance. Unbelievably, the fact that a mentally ill person becomes dangerous with a gun is interpreted as a statement that gun ownership should be restricted to those of sound mind, which is a paraphrasing of the opinion that gun ownership should be denied to everyone without question. This is a clear example of how the mind of a leftist can perceive the world in such a perversely convoluted way that nothing at all can be understood. Gold is struck however, when this reviewer, among all their groping in the dark and trumpeting of their socialist dross, mentions that the protestors represent 'radicals on the left, who loom as a menace waiting to happen' (even though all citizens are represented here; it is not a partisan uprising in the movie, even if it happens to be

the movie's intention for interpretation in the real world), and manages to pick up on the fact that the protagonist is 'to all appearances, empty by design'; well done for spotting that, at least.

When it comes to understanding what Hollywood is for, however, few critics get as close as Devon Stack. He cites Thomas Wayne as a President Donald Trump figure, and the three subway train victims as representatives of Trump supporters marked for execution, all of which is a worthy consideration considering the era of the movie's release, even though the message is about much more than this. But the point here is that Stack understands, more than any other reviewer, that Hollywood products are racist and sexist in the extreme, and is the only one able to say it. He is also aware of the familial estrangement Narrative running through all Hollywood products, so correctly picks up on the fact that Arthur is looking for a father figure. Actually, this is obvious enough to warrant only ridicule of the reviewers who are unable to notice and mention this basic point, and it is not particularly insightful. Also, he picks up on the fact that childhood trauma is what leads to Arthur's laughing condition, but only mentions, regarding this, that the movie does not prosecute Penny for her crimes, although there is a lot more to unpack in this circumstance. Another aspect of the movie which Stack gets snagged by is the assumption that there is something 'decidedly feminine' about Arthur, because he wears makeup and because his dancing is peculiar, while also mentioning that he is seen to speak and sit 'like a woman'. Sexual deviancy is not dealt with or propagated by Hollywood, however; its remit is very limited in that respect, and these assumptions about Arthur's character are false leads entirely. He also refers to the uprising as 'antifa' riots, and to Arthur as the leader of these. There is an element of truth in this because the riots are intended to be an incitement to a socialist uprising of some kind, or the encouragement of this in its covert, slow form. This is misleading, however, considering the identity of the rioters and the objects of their anger, as discussed. Calling this 'the most accelerationist movie maybe of all time' is a reasonable statement, however, although he does revert to mentioning, as others have, that the real message concerns Arthur's powerlessness. His review is dominated by the idea that it is chiefly an exercise in typology, saying 'there is nothing original' about it, although this is the red herring working as intended. And while he also cites the absence of leftist propaganda as being conspicuous by its absence, that also remains a superficial reading.

These reviews only confirm the need for education in the purpose of Hollywood products and the true extent of their detailed planning and ideological convictions. These reviews also seem to confirm that people are not enjoying these movies; the writers betray the probability that their greatest pleasure comes out of tearing these movies down, feeling oneself to be greater than these accomplished works. One also senses that there is practically no appreciation of the genius of this art. This is the other important reason, besides inoculation against the propaganda, for promoting the education about Hollywood products, because these movies could be instantly rendered infinitely more interesting and revealing than ever thought possible, and thus all the more entertaining; finally a welcome reversion to what was always believed to be their ostensible purpose.

# media mentions

## Hollywood products

13 Reasons Why ('television' series) (2017 - )

Batman ('television' series) (1966 - 1968)

Breaking Bad ('television' series) (2008 - 2013)

Fargo ('television' series) (2014 - )

Preacher ('television' series) (2016 - 2019)

The Good Doctor ('television' series) (2017 - )

The OA ('television' series) (2016 - 2019)

The Simpsons ('television' series) (1989 - )

The Wire ('television' series) (2002 - 2008)

101 Dalmatians (1961)

A.I. (2001)

Apocalypse Now (1979)

Arthur (1981)

Bambi (1942)

Battleship Potemkin (1925)

Bedtime for Bonzo (1951)

Being There (1979)

Beneath the Planet of the Apes (1970)

Big Hero 6 (2014)

Blade Runner (1982)

Blow Out (1981)

Conquest of the Planet of the Apes (1972)

Death Wish (1974 - 1994)

Double Indemnity (1944)

Dumbo (1941)



Escape from the Planet of the Apes (1971)

Fantasia (1940)

Frozen (2013)

Happy Feet (2006)

His Girl Friday (1940)

Ice Age (2002)

Key Largo (1948)

King Kong (1933) (1976) (2005)

King of Comedy (1982)

Madagascar (2005)

Meet John Doe (1941)

Metropolis (1927)

Modern Times (1936)

Oliver! (1968)

Pinocchio (1940)

Planet of the Apes (1968)

Psycho (1960)

Schindler's List (1993)

Shall We Dance (1937)

Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs (1937)

Surf's Up (2007)

Taxi Driver (1976)

The Lego Movie (2014)

The Matrix (1999)

The Roaring Twenties (1939)

The Shining (1980)

The Terminator (1984)

The Wizard of Oz (1939)

Treasure Island (1950)

V for Vendetta (2005)

Wreck-It Ralph (2012)

Zootopia (2016)

Zorro the Gay Blade (1981)

### other media

Chiquitita (song) (Abba, 1979)

Smile (song) (1954)

The Moon Is a Silver Dollar Shining Up in the Sky (song) (Lawrence Welk, 1939)

The Star Spangled Banner (song) (Francis Key, John Smith, 1814)

The Streets of Laredo (song) (Frank Maynard, 20th century)

Tonight You Belong to Me (song) (Billy Rose, Lee David, 1926)

White Room (song) (Cream, 1968)

Rain, Steam and Speed - The Great Western Railway (painting) (James Turner, 1844)

[https://listofdeaths.fandom.com/wiki/Bates\\_Motel](https://listofdeaths.fandom.com/wiki/Bates_Motel)

[https://batesmotel.fandom.com/wiki/Deaths\\_on\\_Bates\\_Motel](https://batesmotel.fandom.com/wiki/Deaths_on_Bates_Motel)

Hollywood will now 'spellcheck' its scripts and advertising for lack of diversity (<https://www.rt.com/usa/481311-hollywood-geena-davis-spellcheck-bias/>) (article) (Zachary Leeman, 2020)

<https://www.infowars.com/> (Alex Jones)

<https://blackpilled.com/> (Devon Stack)

(the works of 'William Shakespeare') (book) (16th century - 17th century)

A Far Country (book) (Winston Churchill, 1915)

A Good Man Is Hard to Find (book) (Flannery O'Connor, 1953)

Crime and Punishment (book) (Fyodor Dostoevsky, 1866)

Esoteric Hollywood (book) (Jay Dyer, 2016)

Esoteric Hollywood 2 (book) (Jay Dyer, 2018)

Great Expectations (book) (Charles Dickens, 1861)

Iliad (book) ('Homer', 8th century BCE (approx.))

Information War: American Propaganda, Free Speech and Opinion Control Since 9-11 (book) (Nancy Snow, 2003)

Jane Eyre (book) (Charlotte Bronte, 1847)

National Security Cinema (book) (Matthew Alford, Tom Secker, 2017)

Nineteen Eighty-Four (book) (George Orwell, 1949)

Pale Fire (book) (Vladimir Nabokov, 1962)

Peter and the Wolf (book) (Sergei Prokofiev, 1936)

Prometheus Bound (book) (Aeschylus, 5th century BCE)

The Book of Deuteronomy (book) (7th century - 5th century BCE)

The Histories (book) (Herodotus, 5th century BCE)

The New Testament (book) (1st century - 4th century CE)

The Q'uran (book) (7th century, CE)

The Republic (book) (Plato, 4th century BCE)

The Trial (book) (Franz Kafka, 1915)

The Wars of the Jews (book) (Josephus Flavius, 0075 (approx.))

## recommended related media (a small selection)

Abraham-Hicks Publications (<https://www.abraham-hicks.com/>)

David Icke (<https://www.davidicke.com/>)

Deborah Tavares (<http://stopthecrime.net/>)

Felix Lace (<https://blackpigeonspeaks.com/>)

Kerry Cassidy (<http://projectcamelotportal.com/>)

Red Ice Radio (<https://redice.tv/red-ice-radio>)

Because We Say So (Noam Chomsky, 2015)

Breaking the Spell (Nicholas Kollerstrom, 2015)

Caesar's Messiah (Joseph Atwill, 2011)

Darwin's Black Box (Michael Behe, 2006)

Degenerate Moderns (Michael Jones, 1993)

Empire of Illusion (Chris Hedges, 2009)

Everything You Need to Know But Have Never Been Told (David Icke, 2017)

Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (Michael Denton, 1996)

Illuminati Agenda 21 (Dean Henderson, Jill Henderson, 2018)

Jesus and the Lost Goddess (Timothy Freke, Peter Gandy, 2002)

Latitude 33 (Walter Bosley, 2007)

Musical Truth (Mark Devlin, 2016)

Population Control (Jim Marrs, 2015)

Primetime Propaganda (Ben Shapiro, 2011)

Propaganda Blitz (David Edwards, David Cromwell, 2018)

Race Differences in Ethnocentrism (Edward Dutton, 2019)

Secret Societies and Psychological Warfare (Michael Hoffman, 2001)

Shakespeare's Secret Messiah (Joseph Atwill, 2014)

Sinister Forces (Peter Levenda, 2005)

Talisman (Graham Hancock, Robert Bauval, 2004)

Tavistock Institute (Daniel Estulin, 2015)

The Big Lie (Dinesh D'Souza, 2017)

The Climate Chronicles (Joe Bastardi, 2018)

The E.U. (David Barnby, 2014)

The Mecca Mystery (Peter Townsend, 2018)

The New Confessions of an Economic Hit Man (John Perkins, 2016)

The Secret Origins of the First World War (Gerry Docherty, Jim Macgregor, 2013)

The Third Way (Joseph Farrell, 2015)

The True Story of Fake News (Mark Dice, 2017)

They Were White and They Were Slaves (Michal Hoffman, 1991)

Titanic Britain (Joe Cater, 2016)

Weird Scenes Inside the Canyon (David McGowan, 2014)

Your Thoughts Are Not Your Own (Neil Sanders, 2012)