

The Importance Of Covering Up The Epstein

Fantasy Free Economics, James Quillian

Posted on [August 28, 2019](#) by [Fantasy Free Economics](#)



The terms conspiracy theory and conspiracy theorist are evoked as a means of protecting a lie. I have never heard either term used in any other way.

Collective action as a matter of fact is conspiracy based. All who approach government for any reason are part of a conspiracy. I don't know of a case where one and only one person has taken a matter before congress where any kind of change has occurred.

There is no way to address problems without observing conspiracies. Conspiracies may or not be secret. If a conspiracy is secret, it is not necessarily illegal. A person acting alone can have nefarious intentions just as can a group of people.

Immediately following the reporting of Epstein's death, before the news had even been digested, from a chorus of news outlets, warnings were going out about what conspiracy theorists were going to do with the issue. That alone indicates a plan is in effect. Translated into plain English this means. "If you question what has gone on here, we are going to make a fool out of you." or, "Don't listen to anyone who contradicts what you are going to be told over the coming days." The coordinated use of terms which are used to protect a lie is an indication that a lie is being told.

The art of not knowing is a skill good politicians cultivate. There are lots who know what is going on. They are pretending they don't know because it is in their personal best interest to assume that posture. Why else would no politicians speak up?

The reasoning is that it is better to let a multitude of important people who are guilty of child sex crimes get off scott free than it is to allow the the power structure of the world to collapse. Look at some of the names known to be on the list.

I read a story one time about a group of parishioners who were concerned that a mob boss was a member of the parish. They told the priest the mobster should be excommunicated. The priest agreed but explained that under current circumstances that was not possible. The mobster tithed more than anyone else and the parish would not survive financially without his money. This is the reasoning of politicians who are not speaking up about what is going on with respect to Jeffrey Epstein. The fallacy in this is based on the misguided approach that the "end justifies the means." The nature of the fallacy is that it is the means that produces the final outcome. The story was fiction but the principle holds true.

So, the number of of elites guilty of sex crimes in the Epstein affair is so great that the power structure of the world would crumble if they were all exposed. Would Democrats, Republicans, Deep State,

Media, Trump Administration and corporate leadership not have a huge incentive to work together to protect themselves? Is there any reason why they would not work together to make their common problem disappear? There is certainly a greater chance they would than they wouldn't.

But, those groups never agree on anything you might say. They would get passed that to accomplish this. They can argue later.