

# **A War on (Free) Natural Immunity**

Analysis by [Tessa Lena](#)

**This article was originally published [here](#).**

As I am typing this, we are on the receiving end of a top-down war on everything that's natural, be it natural free expression, natural immunity, or natural ability at large.

Different aspects of today's bizarre reality are connected like pieces of a puzzle. The trendy political correctness, for example, draws from the same logical root as vaccinating people with natural immunity.

How so? Well, political correctness exists to ensure that conversational spaces are safe spaces — and the need to make them safe is based on the premise that human beings are not capable of navigating unregulated conversational spaces without being harmed. Those who are capable of doing so should act as if they are not.

The assumption here is that the natural ability to deal with unregulated conversations does not exist, is not necessary to develop, and mentioning the need for it is cruel. Similarly, forcing the famous medical product on those with natural immunity is based on the premise that artificial immunity is superior to natural immunity.

Furthermore, the strong push for the product, combined with an attack on anyone who even squeaks about comparable benefits of anything natural — be it a healthy life style or actual natural immunity — presumes that artificial tools and mechanisms should be used to replace the natural ability of the body to stand up to pathogens.

And similarly, both an expectation of natural immunity in anyone and a refusal to supersede or replace one's natural immunity with an artificial one are framed as cruel. I posit that in logical and commercial terms, this war on the natural world, natural immunity — and natural ability at large — can be explained with clarity in terms of what is known as the “blue ocean strategy,” with an infusion of transhumanist ideology of human body as a [product] platform.

The **blue ocean strategy** is a business strategy that proposes creating a brand new market out of thin air and dominating it (a blue ocean) – as opposed to trying to compete in an existing market (an ocean red with blood).

Here's how it applies to natural immunity. A healthy person with a natural immunity might be a happy person – but to a 2021 biotech entrepreneur, who views the human body as a market to dominate, he is a sheer insult. From the standpoint of that entrepreneur, replacing the default natural immunity of the past millions years with a fully artificial tool that requires a “subscription” throughout one's entire lifetime (see “variants” and “boosters”) is desirable.

Replacing the default natural immunity with an artificial tool is a very successful case of creating a brand new market (“artificial immunity market”) out of air. A life-long subscription to artificial immunity, with an ever-expanding range of necessary “upgrades,” is a lot more profitable than some rookie traditional shop selling vitamins. Even better, if artificial immunity destroys the natural immunity, customer loyalty is guaranteed. See how elegant?

Somewhat similarly, the notion that people can say what they think, and everyone officially survives unscarred, does not help sell censorship or behavioral modification as a means of “protecting others.”

If, on the other hand, people are officially deemed as lacking the ability to talk over differences or to process information and make reasonable sense of it – or if people's natural ability to communicate with others in a healthy way is artificially impaired through social distancing, face wearables, and political correctness – lots of new needs are generated right then and there.

Among other things, it opens new market opportunities for mass scale “mental health management systems” and the behavioral modification tools, including behavioral modification software, known as “**digital vaccines**.” Now, let's look at the other side of it. Let's look at the economy at large from the psychological perspective of an extremely wealthy person, trillionaire-level wealthy.

A question: Who are we, regular citizens, to the people with near-unlimited financial and political power? Who are we to those who can invest into their vision almost infinitely, and thus shape our society and perception?

It seems like to the people with the most financial and political resources, we are four things: One, we are clay from which they like to mold their play reality, creating worlds and wars,

experimenting, and testing out hypotheses. Two, we are the labor, producers of goods and services.

Three, we are the consumers, buying stuff that their production facilities have produced and contributing to the semblance of a functioning market, even though they make most of their money on extraction and speculation. And four, we are a natural resource, like land or water.

Historically, during the times of feudalism, we were mostly one and two. Then, when the industrial revolution happened, number three was added to the list due to the sudden drop in production costs and an increase in the amount of stuff that could be made on the conveyor.

And now, we are approaching the phrase where number four becomes very interesting to the most powerful people of our planet. Robotics is mighty, fewer people are needed to make things – and what to do with all the useless eaters?

Well, see, in an artificial world, everything is possible, and useless eaters are not so useless in a fully controlled environment, as long as they are viewed as data bundles, also known as digital twins. As long as they have “needs” (as defined by the people seeking to profit), the “improvement” of their condition can be plugged into various impact investment models, and then our useless eaters they become very useful!

Here is how this economic system works: Let’s say, the “government” – in quotes, because in the 4IR model, the government could be theoretically a software program – generates currency as needed.

Our useless eaters, of course, get universal basic income on the condition of doing what they are told. But their most valuable asset to the economy is their “needs.” I don’t mean their actual human needs – but “needs,” as defined by some kind of World Economic Forum-like set of formal parameters.

Perhaps they are prone to getting infected with a virus and need v-s? Or maybe their mental health does not meet the numerically defined markers? Or else they could possibly be in need of behavioral modification, such as getting treated for meat addiction, because climate change? So many markets! So many opportunities! And who then steps in to improve their condition?

The most nepotistic corporations, of course, through public-public partnerships. So first, the “government,” working with NGOs, funded by the very corporations seeking to profit, announces an important public “need.”

The most nepotistic corporations then receive piles of currency from the “government” to solve those “needs,” from developing housing projects to developing patented artificial foods to creating gene therapies and behavioral modification programs. Those things are then dumped onto the useless eaters, regardless of what they think of it.

And so the useless eaters get stuff “for free” but they cannot choose, and their bodies are part-owned by corporations. Which, if it really goes this way, puts us back into the Soviet Union with a dystopian twist (and that has nothing to do with isms).

And since human beings are not designed to live like mechanical soldiers or remote-controlled meatbags, and this will lead to a very bleak society if we let it happen, we better wake up to the anatomy of how the New Normal really works, and soon. The end.