

# Yanks to the Rescue - Again!

Critique of the Time Magazine Article:

*The Secret History of the Shadow Campaign That Saved the 2020 Election*

Roger Golden Brown

Published September 12, 2024

Find this PDF [here](#) and lots more Global Coup related material on my [Quasar website](#).

And check out my [Author Page](#) for all of my published books - this includes paperbacks and ebooks. The content of the paperbacks reflect my truer inner self, predating my current seemingly necessary focus on world affairs. The ebooks include four Free world affairs oriented titles.

## Preface

The purpose of this PDF is to expose the reader to an article and to critique its introductory first section, exposing its machiavellian mindset. Or, to be more precise, their own words expose their machiavellian mindset and my critique comments on just how totalitarian and off the rails the lefties have become - they are participating in the new liberal world order and view anything in their way as obstruction and characterize it as an assault on all things good and decent.

On February 4, 2021, shortly after the 2020 election, and just 2 weeks after Joe Biden took office, an article by Molly Ball was published on the Time Magazine website, [The Secret History of the Shadow Campaign That Saved the 2020 Election](#). In the article, the author and the players mentioned in the article openly boast about a conspiracy to bring about the election results they wanted, and explain how they did it.

Note that Time Magazine is owned by Marc Benioff, a Board member of the World Economic Forum, and a Young Global Leader.

The bulk of the article goes into detail about what was done to "save" the election; essentially from a fair democratic process, in order to achieve the "proper outcome." This paper will quote from just the first part of the article that introduces the "conspiracy".

Quotes from the article are indented like this paragraph.

## Yanks to the Rescue - Again!

In an article in Time Magazine by Molly Ball, *The Secret History of the Shadow Campaign That Saved the 2020 Election*, she begins by describing the joy of the unexpected victory as the results of the "democratic process" were announced:

The nation was braced for chaos. Liberal groups had vowed to take to the streets, planning hundreds of protests across the country. Right-wing militias were girding for battle.

As President Trump refused to concede, the response was not mass action but crickets. When media organizations called the race for Joe Biden on Nov. 7, jubilation broke out instead, as people thronged cities across the U.S. to celebrate the democratic process that resulted in Trump's ouster.

This paints the picture that jubilation was the overwhelming feeling people had; clearly the author needs to get out more. The article then goes on to explain and boast about the "conspiracy" that was necessary to protect democracy from Trump's assault on it:

To the President, something felt amiss. "It was all very, very strange," Trump said on Dec. 2. "Within days after the election, we witnessed an orchestrated effort to anoint the winner, even while many key states were still being counted."

In a way, Trump was right.

There was a conspiracy unfolding behind the scenes, one that both curtailed the protests and coordinated the resistance from CEOs. Both surprises were the result of an informal alliance between left-wing activists and business titans. The pact was formalized in a terse, little-noticed joint statement of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and AFL-CIO published on Election Day. Both sides would come to see it as a sort of implicit bargain—inspired by the summer's massive, sometimes destructive racial-justice protests – in which the forces of labor came together with the forces of capital to keep the peace and oppose Trump's assault on democracy.

Suggesting one's belief that something is amiss is an "assault on democracy"? I think not. Voicing opinion, and asking for oversight and forensics is what democracy should do and be.

And then it's explained how you go about protecting democracy - powerful people, lots of money and influence, and controlled information, done in secret:

That's why the participants want the secret history of the 2020 election told, even though it sounds like a paranoid fever dream – a well-funded cabal of powerful people, ranging across industries and ideologies, working together behind the scenes to influence perceptions, change rules and

laws, steer media coverage and control the flow of information. They were not rigging the election; they were fortifying it. And they believe the public needs to understand the system's fragility in order to ensure that democracy in America endures.

In that last sentence it seems the fragility they are referring to is that it's possible that left to its own unimpeded process the results of an election could get someone elected who they don't want. And they then conflate "Democracy" with the right person being elected, implying that with Trump as president we don't have a democracy.

And fortifying? The thing is, they weren't fortifying it against fraud or malfunction; they were fortifying it against it spitting out an undesirable outcome. "Fortifying" is elegant doublespeak.

Their arrogance is unmitigated.

The author goes on to explain how in order to protect democracy they had to aggressively clamp down on free speech, allowing only information to be spread that helped their side; information that helped the other side was labeled as disinformation and therefore censorable:

Laura Quinn, a veteran progressive operative who co-founded Catalist, began studying this problem a few years ago. She piloted a nameless, secret project, which she has never before publicly discussed, that tracked disinformation online and tried to figure out how to combat it. One component was tracking dangerous lies that might otherwise spread unnoticed. Researchers then provided information to campaigners or the media to track down the sources and expose them.

The solution, she concluded, was to pressure platforms to enforce their rules, both by removing content or accounts that spread disinformation and by more aggressively policing it in the first place. "The platforms have policies against certain types of malign behavior, but they haven't been enforcing them," she says.

Quinn's research gave ammunition to advocates pushing social media platforms to take a harder line. In November 2019, Mark Zuckerberg invited nine civil rights leaders to dinner at his home, where they warned him about the danger of the election-related falsehoods that were already spreading unchecked. "It took pushing, urging, conversations, brainstorming, all of that to get to a place where we ended up with more rigorous rules and enforcement," says Vanita Gupta, president and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, who attended the dinner and also met with Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey and others. "It was a struggle, but we got

to the point where they understood the problem. Was it enough? Probably not. Was it later than we wanted? Yes. But it was really important, given the level of official disinformation, that they had those rules in place and were tagging things and taking them down.”

Note how 1984ish it is that Vanita Gupta, who boasts of succeeding in establishing an effective partisan censorship, is president and CEO of an organization titled: Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

And note also that she refers to it as "official" disinformation. This evokes the imprimatur of authority; like there is a category of information (words, speech, thoughts, ideas) that is unauthorized and is to be recognized as deserving of being silenced.

Ending the first section of this long article, they talk about how close we came to disaster and that "every attempt to interfere with the proper outcome of the election was defeated":

This is the inside story of the conspiracy to save the 2020 election, based on access to the group's inner workings, never-before-seen documents and interviews with dozens of those involved from across the political spectrum. It is the story of an unprecedented, creative and determined campaign whose success also reveals how close the nation came to disaster. "Every attempt to interfere with the proper outcome of the election was defeated," says Ian Bassin, co-founder of Protect Democracy, a nonpartisan rule-of-law advocacy group. "But it's massively important for the country to understand that it didn't happen accidentally. The system didn't work magically. Democracy is not self-executing."

## Conclusion

The psyop in all of this is exposed when they refer to defeating Trump as "the proper outcome", as opposed to praising a proper process. The psyop being the portrayal of democracy as a thing and defined by a static condition as defined by them, instead of recognizing democracy as a process defined by fair, open, honest participation by the populous.

I finish with a quote from John Judge, a political researcher and speaker from way back, that gives an idea of what democracy should be, that I think is well said:

“What a democracy would be, it seems to me, is that any particular social decision that affected people would have to be made by those people that are affected. And the fight for democracy or democratic rule is to

constantly expand that definition to further include and more directly involve all those people.”

In other words, democracy should be an open and transparent participatory process; not a pre-determined result that satisfies a cabal of powerful, well-positioned influencers.

See a video of John Judge speaking: [John Judge, Researcher Extraordinaire, on Community and What Real Democracy Would Look Like](#)

The July 15, 1995 Time Magazine Cover, *Yanks to the Rescue*

